

Mr HUTCHINSON's
E X P O S I T I O N
O F
C H E R U B I M,

And his Hypothesis concerning them examined :

In Three Discourses.

Wherein also what hath been advanced by
by some late Writers, in support of his Doctrine,
is occasionally considered.

“ Eo ingenio sum—ut nisi ubi INTERPRÉTATIO com-
“ mode & absque salebris eat nunquam mihi satisfacere so-
“ leam.” *Jos. Medi Resp. ad Lud. de Dieu. Int. Medi*
Op. p. 569.

“ CONJECTURES which are merely so, and more especially
“ such as are NEW, should be well examined before they
“ are received as *real Truths*: Or before they are admitted
“ to the same Rank and Credit which is due to ancient
“ and generally received Interpretations.” Dr *Hodges's*
Elibu, p. 44.

By THOMAS SHARP, D.D.

Archdeacon of NORTHUMBERLAND,

And Prebendary of DURHAM.

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. and P. KNAPTON in Ludgate-Street.

MDCCLV.



T H E
C O N T E N T S.

Discourse the First.

Sect. I. **T**HE Introduction. Page 1

II. Cherubim *not justly to be accounted a compound of che, like, and Rubbim, the Great Ones.* 9

III. *The proofs of Rub, and Rubbim, as divine Titles, considered.* 34

IV. Cherub and Cherubim *not duly distinguished from each other, by Mr H. and his followers.* 74

V. *Mr H.'s hypothesis not supported by Ezekiel's description of a Cherubic form.* 99

ii *The* CONTENTS.

Sect. VI. *Nor by probable evidence of Ezekiel's three brute animals, being emblems of the Divine Persons.* — Page 131

Discourse the Second.

- Sect. I. **T**RANSITION to the examination of texts, alledged in favour of Mr H.'s hypothesis. — Page 155
- II. Examination of texts cited from Ezekiel. — — 166
- III. Examination of texts produced from Genesis and before the giving of the Law. — 195
- IV. Examination of texts relating to the Cherubim, in the Tabernacle and Temple. — 246
- V. Examination of texts cited from the Apostles and Evangelists. 294

Discourse

The CONTENTS. iii

Discourse the Third.

Sect.	I.	C HERUBIM <i>understood</i> <i>by the Christian Church, of</i> <i>Angels.</i>	—	Page 359
	II.	<i>The texts of Scripture from whence</i> <i>this notion is taken, examined.</i>		372
	III.	<i>An enquiry into the etymology of the</i> <i>word.</i>	— —	397
	IV.	<i>Conclusion.</i>	— —	415

ERRATA

PAGE	14. line 1. r. Vol. II.
18.	15. r. <i>deductio</i> .
40.	23. r. מוחולל.
41.	Note line 18. for <i>ou</i> r. <i>on</i> .
42.	ditto line 2. r. <i>numerationum</i> ;
43. line 10.	r. <i>cites</i> .
100.	22. r. מן as one word;
101.	26. for <i>factore</i> r. <i>factere</i> .
120.	7. for <i>angel</i> r. <i>angle</i> .
142.	13. r. ὡς ὁ δὲ ἰσ.
144.	5. r. ὡς ἡ.
149.	4. r. ἡ.
167.	17. r. <i>though</i> .
172.	7. r. עי.
433.	9. for אלי r. אלי.
236.	11. r. <i>some say</i> , and line ult. r. <i>spake</i> .
239.	2. for <i>nor</i> r. <i>not</i> .
240.	13. r. <i>Cherubic</i> .
242.	13. for העדת r. העדת.
318.	Note line 1. r. <i>κνίς</i> .
321. line 13.	r. <i>expound</i> .
324.	1. a comma after <i>aside</i> , ditto after <i>Trinity</i> ,
344.	16. a comma after <i>angels</i> ,
349.	27. r. <i>not a master</i> .
363.	Note line 3. r. <i>dissertationes</i> .
378.	ditto line 3. r. μαριονηλασιον.
379. line 19.	r. בקדש.
383.	27. r. διαμανευομενη.
409.	6. r. <i>months</i> ,

[1]

DISCOURSE I.
UPON
CHERUBIM.

SECT. I. *The Introduction.*

MR CATCOTT, in his Sermon on the *Elahim*, referring to *Ezekiel* both for *the name*, and *form* of the *Cherubim*, hath these following words, *p.* 13.

“ THIS then was the appearance (see
“ *Ezek. x. xi. 41.*) The heads of the Bull,
“ the Man, and Lyon together, and of the
“ Eagle. So there were three heads and
“ four visages. The bodies were all join-
“ ed in one. By this signifying the unity
“ of the Essence, and the distinction of
“ the Persons, and man taken into the
“ Essence by his personal union with the

B

“ Second

2 DISCOURSE I.

“ Second Person, whose constant Emblem
 “ was the Lyon——This was named *Che-*
 “ *rubim*, a word compounded of *che*, *quasi*,
 “ a note of likeness, and *Rubim*, the *Great*
 “ *ones*; *Great* in every respect, and in the
 “ highest degree. The animals seen in
 “ this appearance were *Rubims*, *great ones*
 “ among the Creatures; the chief of the
 “ tame, and the wild, and the winged
 “ kinds; so it was named *the similitudes*
 “ of the great ones.”

MR *Hutchinson*, in his *Remarks* on the
Observations of Mr *B.* p. 366. where he
 defends Mr *C.*——’s description of the *Che-*
rubim, says,

“ ’TIS certain that the method of pre-
 “ serving knowledge before *Moses* and let-
 “ ters, was by Hieroglyphics; and the
 “ apostate *Jews* confess, that the know-
 “ ledge of the *Cherubim* came from Para-
 “ dise, as shewed in *Hebrew writings per-*
 “ *fect*, p. 410, 411. And that the hea-
 “ thens had theirs from Paradise, p. 425.
 “ ’Tis certain that the Hieroglyphical Em-
 “ blems were never pretended to be ex-
 “ plained before, and ’tis certain they are
 “ explained now.”

THIS

THIS is to be taken, I presume, in a qualified sense, *viz.* that although several have attempted to explain these Emblems, yet none of them, himself excepted, have had any success in their attempts, or have even pretended to have explained them with such certainty, as to render all future enquiries unnecessary.

AND under the like limitations we should take what he says, *Heb. Writ. perf.* p. 23.—“No man since the Captivity “ever pretended to make the Writings “of *Moses* about the Creation, Formation, “&c. intelligible.”

HE must here mean, and then the assertion is true, that no mere man, but himself, ever pretended to absolute certainty in all his explanations of *Moses* *.

BUT as it is not by what Men pretend, but by what they do, that we commonly

B 2 judge

* THE words immediately following the passage cited above, are these.

“As the construction of them (*viz.* the writings of “*Moses*) gives the idea of *Jehovah Aleim*, though we are “not directed, we are allowed to glory that we so know “*Jehovah Aleim*. And therefore I glory that I have “brought them to not only mathematical or figurative “Demonstration, but to sense, to reason, and all deductions and consequences.”

4 DISCOURSE I.

of their merit and usefulness, no person's exposition of Scripture will be the less esteemed for his not previously engaging for its certainty, or the more valued for being represented by *himself* indubitable.

WE are further told, that besides the certainty of Mr H.'s exposition of the *Cherubim*, the admission of it is a capital Article of Religion.——“ This of the *Cherubim* exhibits the making and performing of the Covenant and Oath; and all Religion was performed before these emblematical Faces.” *Remarks*, p. 366. (See also *Treatise on Power Essential*, &c. p. 50.)——“ The Mosaic Law was properly and peculiarly what was exhibited in the *Cherubim* and flaming Sword, first explained by the Oracle, and by him (*Moses*) renewed in writing. *Use of Reason recovered*, p. 102. Upon which, say the Jews, all their Religion, and upon which, I say, all our Religion depends.” *Glory and Gravity*. p. 107.

AND for the better conceiving the form of the *Cherubim*, so very material to be known, Mr H. caused a print of it to be engraved, representing the two *Cherubim* on the cover of the Ark in the Holy of Holies;

Holies; and above them the *Shecinah*, or Divine Glory, and below them the High Priest sprinkling blood towards the Ark. This he inserted in *Glory and Gravity*, p. 120. and says, *ibid.* that “ both the “ Old and New Testament were writ to “ explain, and are but references to what “ was exhibited in *this Figure*; and all “ the heathen books do but aim at de- “ scribing the Shadows of what was exhi- “ bited in it.”

HE afterwards gave us the same print in his book, intitled, *The Covenant in the Cherubim, so Hebrew writings perfect*, p. 114. And the Editors of his Works have prefixed this plate to several of the Volumes; and have intitled it, *The Christian Covenant in Hieroglyphics*; and have told us moreover in their Preface to the said Works (some of which were wrote in explanation of this Hieroglyphic, and most of them with reference to it) that “ *Cherubim* is one of the uncontested ex- “ planations given by the Author; and “ that they have the permissive power of “ all the Bishops in our Church to make “ the *Cherubim*, as explained to be, an “ *Hieroglyphic, A Sacred Image to describe,*

6 DISCOURSE I.

*“ as far as figures could go, the Aleim and
“ Man taken into their Essence.”*

I AM very sensible that every attempt to call in question the certainty of this Exposition, after such high things have been said of it, will be apt to give offence to many who espouse Mr *H*—’s writings, and may be censured by them as a design *to prevent men* (as Mr *H*. worded it) *from taking the benefit of this knowledge.* Remarks, p. 366. Yet sober and modest enquiries (and such I propose the following shall be) can do nobody harm. They will rather do service if Mr *H*. really had truth on his side, by exciting his advocates to clear up what may yet appear obscure, to confirm what may yet seem doubtful, and to reconcile what may yet be thought inconsistent in his Account of this matter.

NEITHER am I unmindful how possible it is for one who is averse to such enquiries, and who shall perhaps resent the very proposal of them, to insinuate suspicions of Heterodoxy in the propounder of them, as being mistrustful, or not well inclined to believe the Doctrines which are pretended to be exhibited in
the

upon CHERUBIM. 7

the Cherubim. Against suggestions of this nature there is no fence. But, I trust, every judicious Reader will easily distinguish between a *Faith* in the Trinity, Incarnation, Christian Covenant, &c. and a *Faith* in an ancient Hieroglyphical representation of them. The question now before us is not concerning the truth of any of these great Articles of Religion, which are sufficiently established, but concerning the validity of a new Proof of them drawn from a word variously applied in the Old Testament, and a figure not compleatly described therein: Neither of which have been hitherto sufficiently explained. And let the great importance of this *New Proof*, and the strong evidence it carries, be never so positively asserted, yet as it hath not been hitherto admitted among the *Credenda* of the Faithful, it must be looked upon and treated only as a private Hypothesis. And *as such*, it is fitting and reasonable it should be fully stated and thoroughly discussed before it be embraced. And any man, I suppose, may enter into this Scrutiny without imputation or surmise of instability

8 DISCOURSE I.

in his Faith, or stain on his Christian Character.

I HAVE on a former occasion given my Reasons, and therefore I shall not repeat them here, why I choose to form my Remarks on Mr *H.*'s discoveries from the general, but succinct plan of them given by Mr *Catcott*, in his Sermon on the *Elahim*.

S E C T.

S E C T. II.

Cherubim not justly to be accounted a compound of che, like, and Rubbim the great ones.

AS to the word *Cherubim*, Mr *Bedford* thought he discovered no less than four faults in Mr *C.*'s Account of it, on supposition of his deriving *Rubim* from רבב. But as it doth not appear from any thing I have observed, either in Mr *C.*'s Sermon, or in Mr *H.*'s Works, that רבב is the root they assign, and as Mr *Romaine* gives רבה for the root *, by which Mr *Bedford*'s exceptions will be avoided, and above all, because these exceptions depend upon the pointings, which I have before promised

* *Nom. Prop. Int.* " כרוב *Cherub*, Similitudo magnatis " ex רבה." Compare this with what he says, *ibid.* upon " רבב *Rabba*, *Rabbeth. multa sive grandis* ex רבב vel " רבה aut jurgium sive impugnatio, ex רוב vide רבבים " *supra.*"

10 DISCOURSE I.

promised to wave in this dispute; I shall therefore pass over these particulars, and refer the Reader to them in Mr B.'s *Observations*, &c. p. 19. And to the Answer given to those *Observations*, in *Remarks*, p. 381. And to the Defence of the *Observations in Examination*, &c. p. 48. and to the Reply to Defence in *Examiner Examined*, &c. p. 75. And I shall only observe, with respect to Mr Romaine's root רבה, that it will, I believe, be very hard to find any other noun of the form of רוב derived from any word that ends in ה; although he conjectures that כוב, the name of a people, *Ezek.* xxx. 5. may come from כבה *extingui.* But neither of these Etymologies being analogical, they ought not to be allowed without some better Authority for them.

BUT I must not pass over what Mr Bedford observed, in exception to the word being thought a compound of *che* and *Rubim* as Mr C. had asserted, nor the Answers which have been given to his Observation on this head: Which was, (though I think a little too strongly expressed) that "the Oriental Languages do all abhor compositions of words, contrary

upon CHERUBIM. II

“trary to the nature of Greek and Latin.” *Observations*, p. 21.—It is evident he meant not to disallow of compositions in Hebrew proper names, either of Persons or Places, nor of such compositions as are made by joining the serviles to the radicals in *Hæmantick* nouns, or the common prefixes or suffixes to nouns and verbs; among which is כ a note of similitude when prefixed to a noun, and the sign of a gerund when prefixed to a verb in the infinitive. And exclusive of these, compositions in Hebrew words are very rare. And even those few words which are supposed by some to be compounds, are nevertheless thought by others to be altogether as well accounted for without that supposition as with it.

THE Answer given to Mr *Bedford's* exception by *Examiner Examined*, is in these words.

“THERE are more instances (for ought I know) than there are verses in the Bible of words compounded with the Serviles as *Cherubim* is.” p. 77.

AND I own occasional compounds with particles, as with כ in כאלהים, *Gen.* iii. 4. and כאדם, *Hof.* vi. 7. are frequent. But doth

12 DISCOURSE I.

doth this Author find any particle, doth he find כ in particular (for that alone comes up to his point) *so constantly* prefixed to any other noun as to become with it, a standing compound construed in the same manner as uncompounded words are, made the nominative case to verbs, and having the articles ה and את, and the numbers אחד, שני, or ארבע applied to it, as they are to *Cherub* and *Cherubim*? Doth he find such compounds used as nouns with the prepositions על and תחת and בין and אצל, &c. as *Cherub* and *Cherubim* are? And is there any where else such a kind of *Ellipsis* in the language as this Etymology introduces? For according to it כרוב signifies *as, or like the, or a great one*. To make the sense compleat must be added, *that which is, as, or like, &c.* If there be instances of these things let them be produced. The *onus probandi* lies upon those who assert the legitimacy of such a composition: And we should not be required to admit of this word, *as a compound*, upon Mr H—'s assertion without some proof from the biblical Hebrew. For if no other like compound with like constructions of it can be found there, it
is

is reasonable to say, that his Etymology of this word is contrary to the Genius and Custom of the Language.

I AM well aware that I may be told, that if I had consulted Mr *Holloway's* Originals, I might have found a great number of instances of compound words, and particularly of such as are compounded with *Caph* like *Cherub*, as כפף, כפר, כשב, כשב, כבש, &c. And that it is remarkable among the words beginning with כ, into whose Originals he examines, that two thirds at least are supposed by him to be compounded with the כ of similitude. So that there will be instances enough of this sort of composition to answer all the Queries I have been putting in relation to it.

I HAVE not, indeed, paid any regard to the words he has given as so compounded, because, to my thinking, they do not carry with them that evidence or authority which should give them a real weight in this Question. My reason for saying so, shall be tried upon a specimen or two of his compounds with *Caph*, for the satisfaction of such Readers as have not looked into his Originals.

14 DISCOURSE I.

VOL. I. p. 250. כִּבְשָׁן Chibhshan.

“ A FURNACE. LXX. Καμινος.

“ It is found under the artificial root כִּבְשָׁן
 “ Chabbash, to reduce, or subdue, that is as
 “ by fire. For I think each letter in this
 “ Root is put for a word. As the כ for
 “ the note of similitude, *che, sicut, as* ;
 “ the ב for the preposition ב *be, in or by* ;
 “ and the ש by abbreviation for the noun
 “ אש Fire: which is the great natural
 “ Agent for dissipating the parts of Bodies,
 “ and so reducing, subduing, and destroy-
 “ ing their Forms.—Our כִּבְשָׁן there-
 “ fore is compounded of כִּבְשָׁן to reduce by
 “ fire as aforesaid, and שִׁנָּה to change.
 “ And this describes the effect, with the
 “ means of producing it. For by the
 “ force of Fire in the Furnace, Bodies are
 “ subdued or reduced, and their form
 “ changed, and a form that they had not
 “ before is given them. The thing speaks
 “ itself.”

BUT this method of producing *artifi-*
cial roots from various mixtures, and this
 way of resolving words into as many first
 principles or simple elements, as there are
 letters of which they are compounded, is
 a kind of chymistry in language, not only

new

new and unprecedented, but tending, I apprehend, to render the signification of words as uncertain as the imagination of the Artist, who presides over the powers of this Etymological furnace, is fanciful. For thus Hebrew words may be tortured into a variety of senses according to the degrees of refinement that the Operator proposes to himself. For “as *by the force of the fire* (to use our Author’s words, “which are very true) Bodies are reduced, “and their form changed, and a form “that they had not before is given them.”

——So words that are cast (to carry on the Allusion to the Chymist’s Art a little further) Words that are cast into this critical Crucible, contrived for the use of Linguists and Etymologists, and there dissolved and melted down by the force of imagination, must needs be subdued and reduced, and have their original forms changed, and have forms given them which they had not before; Serviles being substituted and standing in the place of radicals, Prepositions sliding into, and reigning in the very heart of Roots, and half words, heterogeneous and foreign to each

16 DISCOURSE I.

each other, being blended and incorporated together.

OUR Author, indeed, has prescribed certain Rules to himself for the *Analysis* of words, to which I believe he strictly keeps; some of which rules are occasionally mentioned in his Experiment upon *Chibshan*. But who shall restrain other persons who shall hereafter undertake to improve upon these processes of *Analyzation*, from following rules of their own equally arbitrary, and from producing senses, *ad libitum*, out of such roots as they shall be pleased to suppose, as he doth, compounded of letters put for words? Or who can hinder them from saying, when they have done, that *The thing speaks itself*? Whereas I humbly conceive, that the *thing itself*, though it should happen to be done in some few cases with some little appearance of consistency, will speak nothing more than what their own fancies suggest to themselves, about certain combinations of biliteral words or curtailed roots, and about certain practicable rules of *Analysis*, and about a probable or ingenious application of those Rules.

THERE

THERE is another way of compounding כבש *a furnace*, which Mr Holloway rejects, as *forced and insignificant*. Orig. Vol. II. p. 251. for it is not according to *his Rules*. And there is another way of compounding כבש (a noun of the same letters with the verb abovementioned) signifying *a Lamb*, which he gives as legitimate, being according to *his own Rules*. Orig. Vol. I. p. 392. — “ This, (says “ he) I think is made of the roots כבה *to* “ *extinguish*, and אש *fire*: to express that “ the Lamb of God should by suffering “ the fire of the Divine Vengeance, due “ to our Sins, *extinguish* the same for us,” —with more to the same effect, *ibid.* p. 393. Concerning which Etymology, if nothing more can be said for the propriety of it, than what he hath given us by way of propheticall allusion to the sufferings of Christ, of whom *the Lamb* was a type, I shall only observe, that the composition of כבה and אש, will scarce be thought to be accounted for from the Reason he offers.——But my design in mentioning this derivation, is chiefly to shew how easily a word of the same textual letters, may be resolved by this Art into

18 DISCOURSE I.

contrary senses, viz. כֶּשֶׁב *to reduce by fire,*
and *to extinguish fire.*

THIS Account of כֶּשֶׁב *the Lamb,* being occasionally brought in upon his examination of another word *of the same letters,* as he observes, *inverted,* viz. כֶּשֶׁב *a sheep,* I am tempted to lay before the Reader what he says upon that noun also.

Orig. Vol. I. p. 392. כֶּשֶׁב *Keshbe.*

“ *A Sheep.* LXX *Aps,* a Lamb. It is a
“ compounded word of mixt roots, being
“ made of the כ *Caph,* of similitude, and
“ שָׁבָה *to captivate,* with שׁוּב *to return,*
“ and so expresses—*Captivorum quasi re-*
“ *versio ac diductio.*”

If you ask how these two roots of such different senses come to be thus mixed, and as it were consolidated, you are told that “ the Captivity of God’s people was
“ *to be turned back, or returned;* that the
“ Devil’s seduction of our first Mother,
“ was an Act of Treason and Usurpation
“ upon God’s Property, and by the Divine
“ Covenant was to be vindicated and *ren-*
“ *dered back.* So שׁוּב שָׁבָה *Shûb She-*
“ *bûth,* *to turn again the Captivity* (an
“ usual phrase for this affair) expresses *at*
“ *once the Catastrophe of our Captivation*

“ to

upon CHERUBIM. 19

"Sin, and Death by the Fall, and the
 "Divine Decree in consequence to *redeem*
 "and save us."

HERE indeed, if שׁוֹב and שְׁבוּת coming
 so close together can express all this *at*
once, it will be no wonder that in a more
 perfect union with each other, made by an
 incorporation of them in the Monosyllable
 שׁ, they should express it more concisely
 and instantaneously. Yet the idea of a
Sheep is not called up by this coalition of
 the words, and does not seem indeed,
 easily to be gathered from it. For this,
 some further reflexions will be necessary.
 And if we recollect that Beasts in Sacri-
 fice, the principal of which were *Sheep* or
Lambs, did typify the manner of our uni-
 versal *Redemption* from the Captivity of
 Sin by *the Lamb*, without Spot, then we
 may find that "כֶּשֶׁב a *Sheep*, or *Lamb*,
 "was a more general type of this affair,
 "as the *Ram* caught in the thicket by his
 "horns (instead of the *Lamb* which *Abra-*
 "*ham* said God would provide for him-
 "self, *Gen.* xxii. 8, 13.) was a more spe-
 "cial one." *ibid.* 392.

THE connexion, it must be owned,
 would have been something more visible

20 DISCOURSE I.

if כשב had been the word in *Gen.* xxii. which is referred to. But there the *Lamb*, at ver. 8. is found to be דשה, and the *Ram*, at ver. 13. to be איל. But in an ideal language, the Etymologies perhaps are to be adjusted rather by ideas than by words. So that although שה and איל and כשב are *different* words, yet as they all signify an animal Creature of the *same species*, they may be supposed in an ideal tongue, to throw some light upon each other's derivation.

AND having given these examples of Mr *Holloway's* manner of investigating the true original meaning of Hebrew words, I hope I shall be pardoned for making a general exception against all the compounds with כ, which are produced by him. For though I do not enter now into the consideration of any more of them, I think it will appear to every judicious Reader, that the rest, as well as these, stand solely upon the foundation of Mr *Holloway's* Authority; and that by a like mixture of roots, and a like train of ideas, having some connexion with each other, a chain may be made, without very many links in it, that shall couple together *any word*
with

with any sense that you shall please to assign to it.

To return to the subject from whence I have digressed a little.

MR *Hutchinson* had something more than his own conception to plead in behalf of the *Caph* of similitude prefixed, in *Cherub*. He quotes *Robertson* *, and the *Rabbins* † for it. Though they were not the best Etymologists, or had they been better than they are, one would scarce have imagined Mr *H.* should have followed them in any thing that did not fully accord with the Scriptural Hebrew.

Examiner Examined, further observes, p. 77. "If the *Cherubim* represented persons, sure it was proper for Mr *C.* to say it was the Custom of the Hebrew and other oriental Tongues, to com-

C 3

"pound

* "Est autem annotandum quod Doctores Hebræorum (ut testatur R. D.) putarunt כ in כרוב esse literam deservientem." *Remarks*, p. 117.

† "The *Talmud*. What is a *Cherub*? The same as רביא like a boy: For in *Babylon* they call a boy רביא. *Chagiga*. Tal. 13. 2."—*Glory and Gravity*, p. 119.

He might have also added כרובא Sicut puer. *Kimchi*, *Alcazar*, &c. Vide *Buxt. Lex. Chald.* 57 *Rabbin*: in voce כרוב. "כרובא in lingua Aramæa, ut Chaph sit litera serviens." *Abenez.*

22 DISCOURSE I.

“pound the names of *persons*: Nothing
“is commoner.”

TRUE, with regard to the *proper names* of Persons, but not true with regard to *appellatives*, or the *common names* both of Persons and Things. *Cherub*, in this use of it, is not a proper name, but the common name of certain Emblems, or Hieroglyphics, in which Persons or Things were represented.

IF it were considered, for instance, merely as the *proper name* of the King of Tyre in *Ezek. xxviii. &c.* (for so some have expounded it there) Or of the person mentioned by *Ezra* (כְּרוּב *Nomen Viri. Ezra ii. 59. and Neh. vii. 61.* Mr Romaine of proper names); no objections in these cases would lie against its being a compound word; excepting that כְּ, as a note of Similitude, never enters elsewhere (that I know of) into the composition, even of a proper name.

OR if *Cherubim*, representing *Persons*, as our Author says, had been any *proper name* by which those Persons were known and distinguished; no exception, but that just now mentioned, could be made against its being a compound; because signs are
some-

sometimes called by the names of the things signified; and statues and pictures by the names of the persons whom they represent. But the case is not so here. For *Cberubim*, as they expound it, of a *representation* of Persons, is a noun appellative, or the common name of a particular species of Emblems, and doth not come within the class of *proper names* any more than תבנית or דמות in *Hebrew*, or *Image* or *Portrait* in *English* do.

AND compound appellatives, as was above observed, are rare in *Hebrew*, and, what is more, uncertain. Now in proportion as they are rare and uncertain conjectures about *this* or *that* word being a *Compound*, and being *so* and *so* compounded are improbable. And if there be no instance at all of such a composition, as that of כ and רוב attended with such circumstances as attend כרוב in the several instances above given, it will grow still more improbable that it should be so compounded.

THE most that can be said, as I apprehend, to countenance such a supposition, is, that whereas several of the ancient Fathers interpreted *Cberubim* by *Multitudo*

24 DISCOURSE I.

Cognitionis; there is no account to be given of this their construction that seems so probable, as that they took the word to be a *composite*, of which רוב was a part. But little weight can be laid upon this, supposing it true, as I shall shew when I come to speak of their sentiments of the *Cherubim*.

IN the mean time, if the word may be allowed to be a compound, let us consider what it is a compound of.

MR H. says it is a composite of *Che*, a particle of likeness, and *Rub*, a *great one*; or plural *Rubbin*, the *great ones*, i. e. the Divine Persons.

BUT as he makes no distinction here between *Rub* and *Rab*, *Rubbin* and *Rabbin*, but gives to the former both in the singular and the plural *that sense* which belongs only to the latter; it may be proper to observe, that in the singular, it is always written כרוב: And therefore if כ be one part of the composition, רוב not רב must be the other. And although in the plural it is often written כרובים, yet it is almost as often written כרובים. And though the *Jewish* copies of the Law have always the former, yet the *Samaritan* copies

copies have always the latter; which when written fully as the regular plural, must be written with the *Vau*. And this must be the rule of pronunciation whether the *Vau* be inserted in writing or not. Hence it is written in *Greek* always with ου; Χερουβιμ in the LXX, Greek Testament, and all the Greek Fathers who mention it: So in *Josephus*, *Philo*, *Suidas*, &c. Whereas in words that are compounded with רב great, the pronunciation by *Alpha* is preserved; as in Παλαθ, Παλααης, Παλααης, &c. in the LXX. Παλα, Παλαου, in the New Testament, &c.

Mr Bate (*Examiner Examined*, p. 75.) makes very flight of this.—“A sort of
“dispute (says he) is raised about the
“pronunciation of the words רב, כרובים
“and כרובים. *Rab*, not *Rob*, says Mr *Bed-*
“*ford*, is applied to Christ in the New
“Testament, and then *Cherubim* would
“have been in our sense of the word *Che-*
“*rabbim*. Can any reason be given why
“רב and רב should not be pronounced in
“the same way, or כרובים and כרובים?
“The word רב is *multitude* and *great*;
“call it *Rab*, or *Rob*, or *Rub*, or what you
“will in English, the sense of the word

“ is

26 DISCOURSE I.

“ is the same. כְּרֻבִים and כְּרֻבִים may
 “ be pronounced differently if he pleases;
 “ but the word is often without the *Vau*.
 “ As the כְּרֻב without the *Vau* is pronounced
 “ *Rab*, and with the *Vau* *Rub*; so כְּרֻבִים
 “ without the *Vau*, may be wrote *Ciberabim*,
 “ and with the *Vau*, *Ciberubim*.”

CAN any reason, says he, be given
 why כְּרֻב and כְּרֻב should not be pronounced
 the same way? I think there may. When
 these two letters come thus together, they
 must be sounded by some vowel. *Rab* is
 one way of pronouncing them, as we
 learn from the word wrote in Greek as
 abovementioned. *Rub* is another way, as
 we learn from those places in the Hebrew
 Scriptures, where the context evidently
 shews, that כְּרֻב is the same word that is
 wrote at other times כְּרֻב, as we find it
 wrote 1 *Chron.* iv. 38. *Esther* x. 3. *Job*
 xxxv. 9. and elsewhere: In all which
 places it is a *noun Substantive*, signifying
Multitude or *greater Part*, not *great* or
 the *great one*. And as the sense of כְּרֻב is
 for this reason different in different places,
 so also should the pronunciation of it be;
 viz. *Rab*, when the context obliges us to
 read it in the sense of *great*, *much*, or
many,

many, and *Rub* when it evidently stands for *Multitude* or the *greater Part*.

THERE are many words in which the *Vau* is not always expressed, in which nevertheless it must be understood. The same is observable as to *Jod*. How this hath happened is a point not very material to examine into. The Fact is so in all the present *Jewish* copies of the Scriptures. Probably these textual vowels might have been occasionally omitted, after the invention of Points, and the want of them supplied by a single dot at the bottom of one letter, or at the top of the next. Be that as it will, yet if it appears plainly by the context, or by a collation of texts, that a word is occasionally wrote without the textual vowel, it ought to be pronounced *the same* as if it were fully wrote; otherwise it is not the same word, neither will it give the same sense. So that whatsoever directs us to the true sense of any word, which is not in writing supplied with its proper vowel, will direct at the same time to the true pronunciation of it also.

AND this does not depend upon the points, but upon the nature of the language.

28 DISCOURSE I.

guage. If *Rab* and *Rub* have their distinct meanings, as was said above (and I do not know that it hath been any where shewn that they have the same meaning, though *Mr Bate* is pleased to assert they have). We are no more at liberty, as I apprehend, to sound רב *Rab* when the sense requires it should be pronounced *Rub*, than we should be in the English Language, if we had no written vowels to certain words, to call B—ll a *Ball*, where the sense required us to pronounce it *Bull*. We are not therefore at liberty to pronounce כרבים *as we please*, or otherwise than it ought to be pronounced when it is fully wrote כרובים. Much less may we pronounce כרוב, (which never varies, or is otherwise wrote) *Cherab*, or its plural *Cherabbim* *.

THERE

* And this appears likewise from the manner in which *Χερουβιμ* and *Παλλι* (as abovementioned) are wrote in the New Testament, the one with a single, the other with a double *Beta*. Had the former been put for כרבים as a compound of כ and רבים *great ones*, it must have been written in Greek *Χεραβιμ*. For the letter *Beth* is doubled in every increment or addition of רב from רבב signifying *great, many*: as appears (to say nothing of the *Dagesh*, which marks the double *Beth* in the pointed Editions)

THERE may, indeed, be cases where we have not any directions (when the pointings are discarded) how to insert the proper vowels in the pronunciation of words. And it is in such cases only, that we can be said to be at liberty to pronounce them *as we will*. But a word or syllable which is at any time compleatly written, shews us the proper pronunciation of it in those other places where its vowel or vowels are dropped in writing. Thus, for instance, in syllables of the same consonants with those abovementioned, only transposed, as רב and בר, (like Mr *Holloway's* inverted בש in כשב lately noted)—רר in ברר, the name of a place frequently occurring

tions) from the Greek way of writing it with a double *Beta* in Παῖσι.

When therefore Mr C. wrote רבִּים (the word he supposed compound with *Che*) *Rubim*, he wrote it agreeably to the full reading of the Hebrew כְּרוּבִים, and the just writing of it in Greek χερουβִּים. But the Analogy of the Language will not bear this manner of writing רבִּים *great ones*, which should be expressed by *Rabbim*. And as for רובִּים *Rubim*, it doth not appear that there is such a word in the Language.—And when Mr H. wrote it *Rubim*, he preserved, indeed, the double *Beth* in the pronunciation of רבִּים. But this neither agrees with the Greek χερουβִּים, wrote with one *Beta*, nor with the Greek Παῖσι, wrote with an *Alpha*.

30 DISCOURSE I.

occurring in *Joshua*, may not perhaps fall, as the word is wrote in that book, under any certain rule of pronounciation. But when we compare *Josh. xv. 15.* "The name of *קִרְיַת סֶפֶר* before was *Kiriath-Sepher*" with *Judg. i. 11.* "inhabitants of *קִרְיַת*," and the name of *קִרְיַת* before was *Kiriath-Sepher*," then we have a certain rule for the vowel that is to be pronounced in the last syllable: And there can be no pretence to read it otherwise, though it be more frequently wrote without the *Jod* than with it.—Thus again *דְּבִירָה* the wife of *Lapidoth*, *Judg. iv. 14.* and *v. 15.* might be liable to be read like *דְּבִירָה* the name of a place in *Josh. xv. 7.* *Debira*, or *Debera*, were it not wrote sometimes fully in the ivth and vth Chapters of *Judges*, *דְּבוּרָה*. But this fixes the manner of pronouncing or reading it, when it is the name of the Prophetess *Deborah*, though the *Vau* be omitted in writing it, as in the two instances above.

AND this rule is more particularly to be observed in the two participles of *Kal*, which are known and distinguished by the *Vau*, in the first or second syllable expressed or understood, *ex. gr.* From שָׁפַט comes

upon CHERUBIM. 31

comes שפטים *Judicantes, Judices.* This from the nature of the Language must be pronounced *Sopetim*, or *Suphetim* (whence *Suffetes*) whether the *Vau* be written or not in the first syllable. And the same rule holds, as I think, in all the participles nominascent.

BUT not to dwell any longer on these distinctions, which I apprehend to be sufficiently established by what is already said. Let it be supposed in the next place, that the word were always written כרב instead of being always כרוב, and always written כרבים in the plural, instead of being only sometimes so written; and let us under this supposition enquire, upon what authority *Rabim*, *Rubim*, or *Rubbim* (call it as you will), is applied as a Scripture-Title or Epithet to the Divine Persons.

MR H. in his *Remarks*, p. 118. quotes *Mayerus Phil. Sacr.* p. 304.—“ Alii paulo subtilius deducunt a כ similitudinis & רב. Et volunt *Cherub* idem esse ac sicut *Rabbi*, h. e. *Sapiens, potens, honoratus & gloriosus.* Hanc sententiam *Corn. à Lap.* commendat in *Comm.* in “*Exod.*”

I CITE

32 DISCOURSE I.

I CITE this in the Latin from Mr H—'s own Edition of the *Remarks*, because in the New Edition of his Works, p. 383. the translation of this quotation stands thus. "Others——will have *Cherub* to "be the same as *like a great one*, i. e. *wise*, "*powerful*," &c. Which version of *fi-cut Rabbi* by *like a great one*, tho' it may favour Mr H.'s notion of *Cherub*, is more than was in the intention of *Mayer*, or of *Corn. à Lap.* seeing that the latter (and the former, who refers to him, could not but take notice of it) immediately explains himself in these words, "*Rab enim sive "Rabbi significat virum magnum, qui "pollet opibus, viribus, scientiâ, gloriâ."* *Comm. in Exod. xxv. 18.*

Now should it appear, as I apprehend it will, upon examination, that the claim of this word singular or plural as a Divine Title, or a known Epithet of the Deity, or of the Persons in the Deity, is one of Mr H—'s singularities, for which he hath no better authority, than some doubtful surmise of its being a term in use for the Trinity, both among the ancient Jews and Heathens; I say, should this be made appear, the propriety of the derivation of
the

upon CHERUBIM. 33

the word by *che*, *quasi*, and *Rubim*, the great ones, how specious soever it may seem at the first sight, will be greatly impaired.

AND as Mr *H.* has attempted many ways to confirm it, and recommend it to his Readers, I shall bring together, and consider, in one view, all that he hath alledged in different parts of his Works, so far as I have been able to collect them, fort them, and throw them into method.

D S E C T.

34 DISCOURSE I.

S E C T. III.

The proofs of Rub, and Rubbim, being applied as Divine Titles examined.

WE are told, (*Glory and Gravity*, p. 119.) that “the Word רוב is “the highest Epithet that the Hebrew “tongue affords. It is *great* in strength, “in power, in wisdom, and whatever can “be termed a perfection.”

AND upon the word רבים we are told. (*Trin. of the Gent.* p. 359.)—“This word “expresses *great* in number, in quantity, “in duration, in powers, in perfections “from any degree even to infinite, or beyond expression.”

BUT yet I must take notice, Mr *H.* has not given us any proof, from instances, that רוב ever signifies what he says, or that there is such a word as רבים extant in the language. All that he says, can only

upon CHERUBIM. 35

only relate to רב *Rab*, and רבנים *Rabbim*. But רב either in the singular or plural number, expresses no more than the words do by which we translate it, viz. *Great, much, many*: All which are applicable, as *epithets* and adjectives, not only to those nouns substantive which he mentions, but to a greater variety: And the dignity of the epithet, or the high ideas it may give in some cases, is owing solely to the nature and properties of the subject to which it is applied. No doubt רב, when it is spoken of God, means *great* as *great can be*; great beyond expression; infinitely so. Yet when spoke of other things, means no more than great in comparison of something that is not so, and which, consequently, will give but a low idea of magnitude or amplitude. But though we give it in it's application to the Supreme Being all imaginable force of expression, yet Mr *H.* has not made out that it is one of God's *standing* or *peculiar titles* in the Hebrew Tongue.

HE says, it is "used for *Aleim*, *Ezra* " v. 8. We went into the Province of " *Judea* to the *House of the great God*, " בית אלהא רבא." *Trin. of the Gent.*

36 DISCOURSE I.

p. 359.—*Glor. & Grav.* p. 120. *Remarks*, p. 384. and Mr C.'s Answer to *Observations*, p. 59.

TRUE, and it is used also for *Asnapper*, *Ezra* iv. 10. אֲסַנְפֵּר רַבָּא; but it is no more a *peculiar epithet* of God, when joined with his name, than the Hebrew גָּדוֹל is; and he could not but know that גָּדוֹל is the word commonly used in Scripture to denote the *greatness* of God: That it is altogether as exalted an epithet as רַב, hath not only the same signification in its application to the Divine Majesty, but is far more frequent in it's usage * under that application.

BUT he was concerned to find instances of רַב and רַבִּים so applied to God in Scripture, as to warrant his making it one of the known and peculiar characters of the Deity.

To this end he has produced a few texts. One of them (see *Remarks*, p. 384.)

is

* גדול יהוה *Psal.* xcix. 2. — cxxxv. 5. גדול יהוה
1 *Chron.* xvi. 25. *Psal.* xlviii. 1. — xcvi. 4. — cxlv. 3.
אל גדול. *Neb.* i. 5. — ix. 32. *Deut.* x. 17. *Jer.* xxxii. 18.
אֲדֹנֵי הַגְּדוֹל. 2 *Chron.* ii. 4. *Neb.* viii. 6. גָּדוֹל
Neb. iv. 8. גָּדוֹל קֹדֶשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל. *Isa.* xii. 6. נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי בִשְׁמִי
גָּדוֹל. *Jer.* xlv. 26.

upon CHERUBIM. 37

is *Exod.* xxxiv. 6. which he quotes thus, “*Jehovah, El, רב*,” &c. and then he stops. And nobody in reading him would suspect from his position of these three words, that אל and רב did not stand together in the Original, or that רב could have any relation to any other word in the text than to אל: And must, consequently, take for granted by this manner of citing and placing them, that they must signify emphatically the *Great God*. But the intire text runs thus. “יְהוָה אֵל the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering (וְרַב חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת *multus misericordiae & veritatis*) abundant in goodness and truth.” I shall make no further remark on this method of quotation, than that he made no difficulty of repeating it a few pages after (*ibid.* p. 391.), where he says, “I find *Exod.* xxxiv. 6. without mentioning the appearance, *Jehovah*, “cried *Jehovah, Jehovah, El—רב—*.”

ANOTHER of his texts produced *Glory and Gravity*, p. 121. and *Remarks*, p. 384. for the same purpose is *Psal.* xxxvii. 11. “But the meek shall inherit the earth, “and delight themselves (says our translation) in the abundance of peace.” He

38 DISCOURSE I.

is pleased to render this — “And delight themselves in **רַב שְׁלוֹם** *the Great One, the Pacified.*”

HE might with equal propriety have added, *Psal.* lxxii. 7.—“In his days “shall the righteous flourish, and **רַב שְׁלוֹם**, *the Great One, the Pacified*, so “long as the Moon endureth.” And also *Psal.* cxix. 165. **רַב שְׁלוֹם**, *the Pacified, the Great One*, to them that love thy law. Let me ask likewise, whether **שְׁלוֹם** is ever found in the sense he ascribes to it? Or whether the common version of it in all these texts by *Peace*, is an improper version?

ANOTHER of his proofs, *ibid.* is from *Psal.* xlviii. 3. “Zion the City of the “Great King.” **מֶלֶךְ רַב**. He will have it “the City of the King, *the great one.*” I wonder he should not here have called to mind our Saviour’s words, *Matth.* v. 35. *Μητε εις Ιεροσολυμα, οτι πολις εστι του μεγαλη βασιλεως.*— not *τε μεγαλη, τε βασιλεως.*— nor *τε βασιλεως, τε μεγαλη.*

Isaiah lxiii. 1. is also cited— “Who “is this that is glorious in his apparel, “travelling in **רַב**, the *greatness* of his “strength? I that speak in righteousness,

“ **רַב**

“רב mighty to save.”—Mr H. in his own edition of *Glory and Gravity*, had given the Latin translation to this text, in which the first רב is rendered by *multitudine*, and the other רב by *magnus*, agreeably to the other versions. But in the *new edition* of his works (*Glory and Gravity*, p. 120.) רב in both places is rendered by *a great One*. — “The great One his strength—A great One to save.”

I HAVE already, in *the Defence of the Dissertations*, animadverted on this, and other alterations made in translating Mr H.’s quotation of this text: and therefore shall say no more about them here. But shall leave the Reader to judge for himself how far this, or any of the texts already offered avail, towards proving רב to be a distinguishing appellation of Almighty God.

THE two following texts, alledged by Mr H. are indeed, more pertinent: In which רב seems to be used as a noun Substantive, and to import *magnas, a great One*.

THE first is, *Isa. xix. 20.* quoted *Glory and Gravity*. p. 120. “He shall send them a Saviour רב & *magnatem, a great*

40 DISCOURSE I.

“One” (or *one esteemed famous*, as it is rendered in *Remarks*, p. 384.) “and He shall deliver them.”

BUT there are two exceptions against admitting this text in proof of his point.

ONE is, that *the great One* here (rendered by the LXX Κριων, by the *Vulgate propugnator*, by others otherwise), may signify any eminent person, by whom God should be pleased to work the deliverance promised. And is by some of the Commentators, as *Grotius*,—interpreted of an Angel—“Angelum qui *Sennacherabi* exercitum confecit.”—

THE other is, supposing it to relate to Christ in a secondary (as I presume it doth), or even in a primary sense, yet it may signify no more than *a great Saviour* *, as Christ is called, or said to be, in a passage lately cited above; רב לרושיע *mighty to save*.

THE other text quoted, *ibid.* (and again in *Remarks*, p. 384.) is רב מחלל כל, *Prov. xxvi. 10.* A passage which has received

* Magnum Servatorem, ut *nubes & fumus pro nube fumosa*, *Isa. iv. 5.* Vide *Crit. Sacr.*

upon CHERUBIM. 41

received as great a variety of interpretations *, as, perhaps, any text in Scripture. That which Mr *H.* approves of, our Translators have also preferred, viz. “The Great (God) that formeth all (*things*), both rewardeth the fool, and rewardeth the transgressors.” But they tell us, at the same time, in the margin, that the Hebrew might be otherwise rendered, viz. “a great (Man) grieveth all, and he hireth the fool, he hireth also the transgressors.”

* LXX. Πολλα χειμαζειται πασα σαρχ.

Vulg.—*Judicium determinat Causas.*—*Jerome* seems here to have read it כר.

Targ.—*Multum dolet caro Stulti.*

Syr.—*Multum patitur caro Stulti.*

R. Levi.—*Magnus*, i. e. Princeps qui in jurgiis versatur omnes dolore afficit.

Sabadiah Haggan.—*Stultus multum vulnerat omnes.*

Cassio.—*Magister obit omnia.* h. e. Sapiens per seipsum non per Stultos curat negotia.

Besides these seven expositions, I have collected eight more out of the Criticks, all of them differing more or less from each other, to which the Reader may have recourse.

And *Schultens* says upon this text, that he could produce above twenty interpretations of it, though few in proportion take כר to mean God.

Calmet says upon the place, Ou sera surpris de voir un seul texte tourné de tant manieres qui n'ont presque rien d'approchant. Il seroit facile de multiplier les versions & les explications, mais c'en est assez de cela pour servir d'échantillon.

42 DISCOURSE I.

“gressors.” And, I believe, it will not be denied, that the words may be grammatically and properly thus rendered. And therefore, though I prefer the version in the text to that in the margin, I may be allowed to say, that the passage is not clear in Mr *H.*’s favour, and should not be urged peremptorily *as a proof*, though it make the most for him, of any that have been hitherto produced.

I CANNOT recollect any other instances of *רב* in the singular, quoted out of Scripture by Mr *H.* for this purpose. He observes, indeed, upon *Exod.* iv. 16. Thou shalt be to him *for Aleim*, that the *Chaldee Targum* substitutes *לרב* for *Master*. (*Remarks*, p. 386.) And he tells us further of a Rabbinical conceit (*ibid.* and also *Hebrew Writ. Perf.* p. 331.) about “*Metathron* * , whose name was *נשם רבו*” “like the name of *his Lord* of whom it is
“written,

* “ *נשם רבו* per Gematriam seu arithmeticam Cabalam per numerosum æquivalentiam est *שׁדׁי* Deus Omnipotens. Unde & *R. Salom.* ad *Exod.* xxiii. 21.—
“ ad Nomen meum in medio ejus, scribit, Rabbini nostri
“ inquit Angelum hunc esse *Metatron*, cujus nomen est
“ *נשם רבו* sicut nomen Domini ejus, nempe *שׁדׁי* Dei
“ Omnipotentis; utrumque enim in numeris valet 314.”
Buxt. Hist. Arc. Fæderis, p. 131.

upon CHERUBIM. 43

“ written, for my name is in the midst of
 “ him, *Exod.* xxiii. 21.” — And lastly
 he observes, that “ this word רב a little
 “ before Christ came, and ever since
 “ Christ, has been abused, and misapplied
 “ to the Apostates, and to those who have
 “ studied the Oriental Languages.” *Re-*
marks, p. 386.

THIS will be considered below, among
 the Authorities he cites from the New
 Testament. The title of *Rabbi* given to
 our Saviour, being one of them. But in
 the mean time I observe, that he should
 have proved by some sufficient evidence,
 that it was *once* a title appropriated to
 God *, before we can allow that apply-
 ing it to men is *abusing and misapplying it*;
 though the applying it to some men, or
 to any men in too high a sense, may be
 acknowledged an abuse, or misapplication
 of it.

CHRIST

* *Kimchi* in his account of the word says, that a man
 of great fame and renown is sometimes called רב, on ac-
 count of his many excellencies or superior degrees of merit
 (his words are לפי שרבו מעלותיו); but he never once
 mentions that it is the *distinguishing title* of God, or so
 much as an *epithet* given to him.

44 DISCOURSE I.

CHRIST hath forbidden his followers to be called *Rabbi*: and so he hath forbidden them in the next verse to call any man *Father* upon earth. Yet he did not intend to prohibit the latter absolutely; and therefore in all likelihood not the former. Or if he did intend to prohibit it absolutely, this doth not prove that it was ever appropriated to God. Indeed רב in the singular, is never used in the Old Testament at all; and רב is used of men, as 2 *Kings* xxv. 8. *Ezth.* i. 8. and of many other finite things. The prohibition therefore must be grounded on this, that the *Jews* had perverted the term, though in itself an innocent one, to wrong purposes, as they had that of *the burden of the Lord*, another innocent term (see 2 *Kings* ix. 25.) which was also prohibited for that reason. *Jer.* xxiii. 33, &c.

MR *Holloway* indeed, has an evidence of רב being a standing Divine Title, which I am persuaded escaped Mr *H.* —It is in his *Originals* under the word רוב. *Rubb.*

“ *TO strive.* μαχουαι *to fight.* —The
 “ root ריב or רוב *to contend in judgment,*
 “ is beholden to another root for its rea-
 “ son,

“son, viz. רבב *to be great*. For the original of all litigation and judgment was this, viz. that man contended with, and rebelled against רב *Rabb*, the great One, God.”—*Originals*, Vol. I. p. 364.

I SHALL leave this remark to its own weight, and proceed to consider Mr *Hutchinson's* authorities for making *Rubbin*, the plural word, one of the Divine Titles. He tells us (*Hebrew Writ. Perf.* p. 305.) that the “Persons in the Essence were *Rubbin* before they were *Aleim*.”—And (*Use of Reason recovered*, p. 15.) that “there was no distinction of the Persons before the Covenant, but רבים *the great Ones*.”

THIS great and important point, on which his construction of *Cherubim* is principally founded, he endeavours to make out in the following manner.

HE finds a Rabbinical Tradition in *Raymund Martini's Pugio Fidei*, and in *Buxtorf's Hist. Arc. Fæd.* * of a discourse between

* The Reader who would see the passages at length, will find the Latin version of them from *Raymund* and *Buxtorf*, in Mr H.'s own edition of the *Covenant in the Cherubim*, p. 242, &c. and an English translation by the editors in the same book, p. 241.

46 DISCOURSE I.

between "הקבה the Holy and Blessed God,
and שטן the Devil concerning the Messiah,
which

Here follows the Abstract or Recapitulation of the said Tradition, by Mr H. *ibid.* p. 305.

" The Jews divide the whole into *Opus Bereshith*, and
" *Opus Marqevab*.

" As this History begins with the first Beings and Things,
" We suppose the Essence of some Persons existed, that is,
" were possessed of power to act; we must shew them pos-
" sessed of that Essence and Power, and endeavour to shew
" how they came by their names; they were *Rubbim*, be-
" fore they were *Aleim*.

" R. *Abba Pugio Fid.* p. 333. and *Synagoga Israelis* in
" *Buxt. Arc. Fœd.* p. 138. cited above, says, *Satan* saw
" a throne in Heaven, and was informed (perhaps em-
" blematically by what he saw on, and above that throne),
" that it was resolved that this system and man should be
" created, &c. And that he saw what he calls the Light
" below the throne, which, what was upon the throne
" called the *Messiah*; both which *Moses*, when the repre-
" sentation of this was exhibited upon earth, calls *Rub-*
" *bim*; and that *Satan* resolved to oppose the design of
" the *Rubbim*, and the happiness of man, and declared
" his resolution to attempt to seduce man, and overcome
" that Light, the *Messiah*. That what was upon the
" throne (to which this *Rabbi*, and their great Synagogue,
" make the Devil give a singular name), entered into co-
" venant with this Light, the *Messiah*, that if he would
" wage war with *Satan*, by withstanding his temptations,
" and by suffering (that) which he was exhibiting at the
" foot of the throne, The world should be created; and if
" man felt what was exhibited there, one man's being
" taken into the essence of the Light, and suffering, should
" redeem man from the grave, and *Satan*, and Hell,
" and

upon CHERUBIM. 47

which occasioned the Covenant and the Oath between the Divine Persons for the redemption of mankind. The word *Rubbin* is not mentioned at all in the whole passage (see the original cited by *Raymund* from *Beresbit Rabba*), though one would be apt to think it was by Mr *H.*'s account of it. He therefore improves upon the scene, and tells us, that *Moses* called the persons covenanting in the rabbinical tradition, *Rubbin*; and that he did so when the representation of this transaction was exhibited on earth, viz. when he called a visible appearance of something which he doth not explain *Cherubim*, or *Che-Rubbin*, *Gen.* iii. 24. For Mr *H.* I think,

" and *Satan* should be destroyed for this opposition and those attempts."

Again at p. 322. Mr *H.* says—" I shall put this in to order of time, to shew the formation of names from actions, by the rules above.

" *Rabbi Abba* and *Synagoga Israelis* say, *Satan* said that (the *Rubbin*) resolved (indefinite) to make a covenant to redeem man, and to bind themselves under אלה an execration, the highest obligation of an oath, to perform their respective parts in the conditions. That he heard them (part. present) execrating themselves conditionally, if, &c.—That after they (verb præterit.) had execrated themselves conditionally, if, &c.—He heard them call themselves (the noun or name) each אלה. " All אלה." See also *Rel. of Satan*, p. 104.

48 DISCOURSE I.

think, doth not pretend that *Moses* used *Rubbin* for the Divine Persons in any part of his writings, excepting where this supposed compound occurs.

BUT doth not this look very much like begging the question, concerning the *Cherubim*, both with regard to the name, and the thing? The Divine Persons are said to be called *Rubbin*, because they are represented by an exhibition called *Cherubim*. And the exhibition is said to be called *Cherubim*, because it represents *Rubbin*. Is not this arguing in a circle? Is there no proof of *Rubbin* but *Cherubim*? And could there be no other meaning of *Cherubim* but *sicut Rubbin*?

BUT Mr *H.* seems to have thought that they proved each other sufficiently, and that they mutually supported each other's claim to his interpretation, by giving and taking reciprocally that meaning he chose to affix to them, though neither of them, as far as appears, hath the sanction of *Moses's* authority for that meaning.

THUS again, when he says, *Remarks*, p. 370. "That *Moses* was not commanded to make a similitude of the *Cherubim*,
" but

“but a similitude of the *Rubbim* ;” it is a kind of begging the Question between him and Mr *Bedford* : Which was, whether *Cberubim* were meant of *Angels*, or signified, by Etymology, *Representations of Rubbim*. The order given to *Moses* was, “Thou shalt make two *Cberubims* of gold.” *Exod.* xxv. 18. The making them of gold implies a *Similitude*, and in either case Spiritual Beings were to be materially represented. Therefore till the meaning of the word can be previously ascertained, the supposition of its being compounded with *che*, *quasi*, is of no weight in the argument : For these golden figures might have been as well the emblems of *Angels* as of *Rubbim*.

NEITHER hath Mr *H.* any authority from *Moses* to say as he doth (*Use of Reason recovered*, p. 208.), that the Mercy-Seat “was of one intire piece of gold “with the substance of the *Cberubim*, to “shew that *the basis* the *Rubbim* stood in, “or upon, at making the *Covenant* was the “same, one, unparted part of their Essence, “the Essence of Christ.”

E

HE

48 DISCOURSE I.

think, doth not pretend that *Moses* used *Rubbin* for the Divine Persons in any part of his writings, excepting where this supposed compound occurs.

BUT doth not this look very much like begging the question, concerning the *Cherubim*, both with regard to the name, and the thing? The Divine Persons are said to be called *Rubbin*, because they are represented by an exhibition called *Cherubim*. And the exhibition is said to be called *Cherubim*, because it represents *Rubbin*. Is not this arguing in a circle? Is there no proof of *Rubbin* but *Cherubim*? And could there be no other meaning of *Cherubim* but *sicut Rubbin*?

BUT Mr *H.* seems to have thought that they proved each other sufficiently, and that they mutually supported each other's claim to his interpretation, by giving and taking reciprocally that meaning he chose to affix to them, though neither of them, as far as appears, hath the sanction of *Moses's* authority for that meaning.

THUS again, when he says, *Remarks*, p. 370. "That *Moses* was not commanded to make a similitude of the *Cherubim*,
" but

“but a similitude of the *Rubbim*,” it is a kind of begging the Question between him and Mr *Bedford*: Which was, whether *Cherubim* were meant of *Angels*, or signified, by Etymology, *Representations of Rubbim*. The order given to *Moses* was, “Thou shalt make two *Cherubims* of gold.” *Exod.* xxv. 18. The making them of gold implies a *Similitude*, and in either case Spiritual Beings were to be materially represented. Therefore till the meaning of the word can be previously ascertained, the supposition of its being compounded with *che*, *quasi*, is of no weight in the argument: For these golden figures might have been as well the emblems of *Angels* as of *Rubbim*.

NEITHER hath Mr *H.* any authority from *Moses* to say as he doth (*Use of Reason recovered*, p. 208.), that the Mercy-Seat “was of one intire piece of gold
“with the substance of the *Cherubim*, to
“shew that *the basis* the *Rubbim* stood in,
“or upon, at making the *Covenant* was the
“same, one, unparted part of their Essence,
“the Essence of Christ.”

E He

50 DISCOURSE I.

HE hath shewn in this passage, that he could out-do the Rabbins themselves in the way of mystick interpretation.

THUS far proceed his proofs of Rubbim from the Pentateuch. And those taken from the other Hebrew Scriptures are as follow.

2 Sam. xxiv. 14. רבים רחמו, *Remarks*, p. 384. These two words he hath thought fit to quote without any version of them, or without any remark upon them, which omission I shall therefore supply. The passage in our translation is, Let us fall now into the hand of the Lord, for his mercies are great (or many, as in the margin) οἱ πολλοὶ οἱ Οἰκτιρμοί, LXX. Quia multa misericordiæ ejus. *Targ. Syr.*

HE quotes a parallel text, *ibid.* viz. *Neb.* ix. 19. ברחמך הרבים, Et in misericordiis tuis multis. This, indeed, he ventures to translate in his own edition of *Names and Attrib.* (where he also quotes it) in the following manner—"Et tu "in miserationibus Tuis *Magnates*." Where he quits the interlineary version by *multis*, for the sake of introducing this amendment. But to what sense, I presume, even his editors could not tell, for they have

have thought fit to drop the translation in this place intirely, referring only to the chapter and verse in *Nehemiah*. And even he himself, contrary to his usual manner, gave the text afterwards in his *Remarks*, without any version of it. And as for any use to be made of the Original in the view he cites it, he might as well have dropped that too. For how should this text (or the former in 2 *Sam.* xxiv.), in which רבים occurs as an adjective to רחמים, be any proof of *Rubbin* being a Divine Title under the sense of *Magnates*?

He produces 2 *Kings* vi. 16. Fear not כִּי רַבִּים אֲשֶׁר אִתָּנוּ מֵאֲשֶׁר אִתָּם, *Quia* multi qui nobiscum quam cum eis. An Hebraism, for *they that be with us are more than they that be with them*, as our version hath it. LXX, οἱ πολλοὶ οἱ μετ' ἡμῶν. So all the other versions—*Plures*.

THIS he also ventures to translate (tho' he gives us not its parallel in 2 *Chron.* xxxii. 7.) in his own edition of *Names and Attrib.* p. 118. Of *Glor. and Grav.* p. 111. and of *Remarks*, p. 119.—“*Quia* “רַבִּים *Magnates* qui nobiscum.”—His Editors have rendered this in *Names and*

52 DISCOURSE I.

Attrib. p. 360. "They that be with us
 " are רבים *mighty*. In *Glor. and Grav.*
 " p. 120. For they are רבים *great*.—
 " And in *Remarks*, p. 334. Because רבים
 " They are *great ones* who are with us."
 —They ought indeed, when they change
 his version, to give notice that they are
 speaking in such change, and not He.
 But neither His nor their versions of רבים
 in this place comport with the words fol-
 lowing, מאשר אותם (as all the common
 versions do, which have each of them a
 word for רבים answering to *multi*), nor
 indeed with the context, "Behold the
 " mountain full of chariots and horses."
 —The most they can be strained to would
 be—"The *Rubbin* are with us in com-
 " parison of what they are with them."
 Which yet, I believe, nobody will take
 to be the true meaning of the text.

ANOTHER place cited by Mr *H.* is
Isa. liii. 11, 12. Where רבים occurs
 three times. On which I must be a little
 more particular, because, according to
 Mr *Catcott*. "This is *that most remark-*
 "*able passage* which will settle the sense
 " of the others, *beyond the power of any*
 "*evafion*."—Let us put this to the test.

One

One might safely venture to rest the whole dispute about *Rubbim* on this single issue.

THE entire passage in our version runs thus.—“ By his knowledge shall my
“ righteous servant justify (לרבים) *many*,
“ for he shall bear *their iniquities*. There-
“ fore will I divide him a portion (ברבים)
“ with *the great*, and he shall divide the
“ spoil with the strong, because he hath
“ poured out his soul unto death; and
“ he was numbered with the transgres-
“ sors, and he bare the sin of (רבים)
“ *many*, and made intercession for the
“ transgressors.”

THE first clause Mr *H.* renders *Glor. and Grav.* p. 120. “ By his knowledge
“ shall my righteous Servant *make* justifi-
“ cation to the great ones.” And in *Re-
marks*, p. 385. “ justify the great ones.”

MR *Catcott's* comment on this clause is as follows.

“ ברעתו by (or in) *his experimental*
“ *knowledge* (the same word as is used,
“ *Gen.* iii. 22.). My righteous Servant
“ צדיק [with the ' Jod, as observed in the
“ Sermon, to shew the effect, i. e. He who
“ by virtue of having discharged the debt
“ for which he was bound (and so was
E 3 “ just)

54 DISCOURSE I.

“just) had power to set free (so to justify)
 “the debtors] יצריק *shall make full payment*,
 “לרבים (observe the ל the sign of the
 “dative case) T O the G R E A T
 “O N E S.”

I G I V E the passage just as he gave it
 in his *Answ. to Observ.* p. 60.

Now to omit all the smaller exceptions
 to this laboured account, I shall only make
 these two remarks,

F I R S T, that although it were allowed
 that יצריק may be rendered (though I
 know not by what authority) *He shall make
 full payment*; yet it doth by no means fol-
 low that לרבים must be rendered T O the
 great ones, since it doth with equal pro-
 priety signify F O R many, or to the use
 of many.

“OBSERVANDUM ל non semper denotare
 “dativum, sed quandoque idem esse quod
 “ל, *super, propter, pro, vice, &c.*” *Buxtorf.*
 Mr *Bate*, also, in his short Grammar,
 speaking of this servile, says, “ל T O,
 “*To the use or purpose of.*” See also *Nol-*
dus in ל. *signific.* 27. And I might fur-
 ther observe, that as ל is the common
 mark of the accusative in *Chaldee* and *Sy-*
riac, so it is a very frequent one in *He-*
brew.

brew. See a multitude of instances in *Noldius* upon the *signific.* of ל. *numb.* 44. p. 411, 412. *Edit. Gen.*

THEREFORE יצדיק לרבים may either be translated, *shall impart righteousness to many*, or *shall justify many*. And either of these versions seems more eligible than Mr C.'s—*shall make full payment to the great Ones*. Especially if we compare this passage with *Romans* v. 15, &c. Οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπεθάνον—Ἡ Δωρεὰ εἰς τὰς πολλὰς—εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαιοσύνην. And this usage of the word πολλοί, in this, and other parallel passages of the New Testament, was probably derived from this passage in *Isaiah*.

My other remark is, that Mr C. hath here thought fit to follow Mr H.'s example in suppressing the words that immediately follow, viz. ועונתם הוא יסבל *for he shall bear their iniquities*; THEIR must refer to רבים (the *many*) and cannot be applied to Mr H.'s *Rubbin*. And these words, if they had been allowed to have held their place in the sentence, they would, I believe, notwithstanding all the pains that have been taken with what goes before, or follows after, have confirmed

56 DISCOURSE I.

our Bible version of MANY, instead of GREAT ONES, beyond *the power of any evasion.*

FOR the next רבים in this passage, Mr H. may seem, indeed, to have some countenance from our translation, viz. "Therefore will I divide him a portion" "רבים with *the Great.*"

BUT nevertheless the construction is as grammatical, and more suitable to the sense of the word in the two other uses of it in this same passage, if we say with Pagnin and others. "Ideo partem dabo ei" "*in multis.*" For it is commonly acknowledged to signify, *I will bestow many upon him; or, I will give him his share, or possession in many.* And the expression in Job xxxix. 17. לא חלק לה בבינה *he hath not bestowed understanding on her,* is exactly parallel in point of construction to this under consideration אהלק לו רבים *I will bestow many on him.* To this sense the LXX Κληρονομήσει πολλας, which, as Mr Lowth observes, is an equivalent expression with, *I will grant him the heathen to his inheritance.* The Vulgate is, Disper-tiam ei plurimos. Targ. Dividam ei prædam populorum

upon CHERUBIM. 57

populorum multorum. Arab. Ipse possidebit multos.

BUT if it be rendered with our Translators—I will divide him a portion with the Great, &c. this will be of no service to Mr H.'s notion. For then the meaning will naturally be *great nations*, or *great personages* in them; the following words requiring this sense—He shall divide the spoil with strong, וְאֵת עֲצוּמִים יַחְלֵק שָׁלֵל. For though God is infinitely strong, yet עֲצוּם is never used of him in Scripture, but is used of *Kings* (Psal. cxxxv. 10.) and of *nations* frequently, and that in conjunction with רַב as it is here, and also in the prophecies of the Messiah, describing his influence in the world. Psal. xxxv. 18. Mic. iv. 3. Zech. viii. 22. And it is proper to say, *He shall divide the spoil with the strong ones*, i. e. obtain part of mankind for his followers, as the wicked powers of Earth and Hell do *others* for theirs.—Or as *Vitringa* translates it, he shall obtain *the strong ones* for a spoil, which answers to *leading Captivity Captive*, Psal. lxxviii. 19. But to say that he shall divide the spoil with the Divine Persons, would surely be a strange expression.

And

58 DISCOURSE I.

And yet if the Divine Persons be meant here by רבים, they are also meant by עצומים.

THE third time that רבים occurs in this passage, is, in these words — “ he “ bare the sin of *many*.”

NOW Mr *H.* hath neither altered the common version here, nor suppressed it. Whereas the editors of his works, or, rather the person who undertook the translations, and had the conduct of the edition, of whom Mr *Bate* can give the best account, though he hath allowed it in one quotation of the text, hath taken upon him to alter it in another, and to suppress it in a third *. Which is a further specimen of the liberties taken with Mr *H.*'s writings.

MR *Catcott*'s construction of this expression is — “ Because he hath poured “ out

* Mr *H.*'s words in his own edition of *Trin. of the Gen.* p. 118. Of *Glor. and Grav.* p. 112. and of *Remarks*, p. 119. are the same, viz. “ Et peccata multorum “ tulit.”

This is rendered in the new edition of *Trin. of the Gen.* p. 360. “ Bore the sin of *many*.” — In *Glor. and Grav.* p. 120. “ He shall bear the forfeiture due to “ the great Ones.” And in *Remarks*, p. 385. The words of the quotation are left intirely out.

upon CHERUBIM. 59

“out his frame unto death, and hath
 “borne (or carried up) חטא רבים † the
 “satisfaction

† His note upon this word, at the bottom of p. 60. is this,

“חטא as a verb doth not signify to *sin* or *offend*, but
 “to be brought under an obligation of making reparation for
 “damage.—The radical sense of the word is given.
 “Gen. xxxi. 39.—That which was torn of beasts I
 “brought it not to thee, אהשנה I bare the loss. Expi-
 “bam illud. *Vulg.* Απελυσσων LXX. I made it good.
 “*Old version.* So the noun is satisfaction for damage or
 “offence.”

According to this account of the word, instead of mak-
 ing Moses tell the people upon the affair of the molten
 calf, *Exod.* xxxii. 30. *Ye have sinned a great sin*, as our
 Bibles have it; it should have been rendered, at least it
 should be understood (חטאתם חטאתם גדולה) *you have*
brought yourselves under an obligation of making reparation
for a great damage. Yet this was the sin by which Mr H.
 says the Israelites renounced Christ their Glory. It was
 their repetition of this offence, or their *walking in the sins*
of their fathers, and of Jeroboam, &c. (in which texts
 חטאת, or it's plural are the words commonly found) that
 occasioned their captivity, and further miseries, *Glor. and*
Grav. p. 184. *Essay.* Nat. Hist. p. 102.

חטא the verb signifies in the most common use of it,
 to offend, and also (though under a different pronunciation
 according to the pointings) to expiate for an offence.
 Of both these senses there are abundance of instances.

The idea of expiating for faults, or exculpating, is easily
 transferred to recompencing for damages; and seems to be
 used in that transitive sense in the text Mr C. cites for giv-
 ing us the radical idea, or primary meaning of it. But he
 has not told us, why this singular usage of the word, should
 give

60 DISCOURSE I.

“satisfaction for sin, and *reparation* for
“*damage* due to *the great Ones*.” *Answ.*
to the *Obs.* p. 60.

BUT here, *observe* there is no ל, or *sign*
of the *dative case*. חטא is in *regimine*,
and רבים is in the *genitive*. “*Substan-*
“*tivum regit substantivum diversæ rei in*
“*genitivo casu.*” And though it be true
that the *genitive case* has a variety of
meanings in *Scripture*, as well as in other
authors, yet, howsoever, we interpret חטא,
whether by sin, or by satisfaction for da-
mage, it is much more easy and rational
to understand it here of the sin, or the
satisfaction of רבים than the satisfaction
due to רבים. The *genitive case*, after חטא
or חטאה, hath frequently the former
meaning,

give and determine the true sense of it wherever it oc-
curs.

He concludes this note with saying, (and it is allowed)
——“That Sin-Offerings bore this name, and that they
“were types of him, who by the one oblation of himself
“once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient satis-
“faction for the sins of the whole world; as it is excel-
“lently expressed in our Liturgy.”——True; and the ex-
pression in our Liturgy is the more excellent, and the
more worthy of our attention, because it plainly refers to
a satisfaction made for the sins of the whole world: חטא
רבים. The *Sin* of the many, and not a satisfaction due
to the *great Ones*.

upon CHERUBIM. 61

meaning, but I believe it cannot be shewn ever to have the latter.

AND for the same reason that *Rubbin* in Mr C.'s construction of the word cannot stand here, as it is the genitive case after רִטָּה, so neither could *Elabim*; and Mr C. might have spared his pains in shewing the impropriety of using *Elabim* * in this passage from other reasons.

THERE is one other instance of *Rubbin* given, or rather pointed to, by Mr H. in his *Comment* on the *Psalms*. Vol. IX. p. 369.

IT is *Psal.* cix. 30. "I will give
"great thanks unto the Lord with my
"mouth, and praise him among the mul-
"titude. וּבְתוֹךְ רַבִּים אֶהְלֵלנוּ." This he
renders

* "As the offence (says he) had been offered against
"the *Rubim*, the *great Ones* as such; and as he who was
"to expiate the offence, and pay the debt, was one of the
" *Elahim*, and so could not, according to the part he was
"to act, as such, (which was to pay the debt) be said,
"as such, to demand and receive the satisfaction; and as
"the humanity was, after the sufferings were over, and
"the debt was paid, to be exalted to the kingdom, to be
"admitted to an equal share in all the perfections in *Je-*
" *howah*, with the RUBIM the GREAT ONES.
"So it appears that the title *Elabim* could not in propriety
"be used in this passage of *Isaiah* for the Persons, but
"RUBIM." *Answ. to Obs.* p. 61.

62 DISCOURSE I.

renders *in the midst of the Rubbim*: under a supposition, possibly, that the expression is equivalent with *בין כרובים*, and consequently may mean, Praise him that dwelleth between the *Cberubim*.

BUT as he hath not explained it either in this sense, or in any other, I can say no more to it, than that I wonder he should find any fault with the common version, since the phrase in the sense there given it, is so agreeable to other passages in the Scriptures, ex. gr. *Psal. xxii. 22.* “*In the midst* (*בתוך*) of the congregation will I praise thee: quoted *Heb. ii. 12.* *ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε.* *Lev. xxii. 32.* I will be hallowed *among* (*בתוך*) the Children of *Israel.* *Prov. v. 14.* In the midst (*בתוך*) of the congregation and assembly.”

THE remaining places mentioned by Mr H. (*Remarks*, p. 385.) are *Jer. xxxix. 13.* and *xli. 1.* “*רבי מלך* *Magnates vel Optimates Regis*, the great men belonging to the King.”

BUT these are barely mentioned by him, (and in a parenthesis too, in his own edition, p. 120.) as if he laid no stress upon them.

AND,

upon CHERUBIM. 63

AND, indeed, I think with good reason; because although they be the only texts produced by him, in which the word in the plural ought undoubtedly to be rendered *magnates*, yet it signifies *magnates* or *great ones* in such an acceptation as will do him no service. For in these texts it is used merely as a common *Chaldee* term, for the principal officers and courtiers of the King. And if *Cherubim* were to be understood as meaning *sicut magnates* in this *Chaldee* construction of רבי, it would go a great way to confirm the notion that Mr H. so strongly declares against, viz. that the *Cherubim* are the representations of *Angels* or *ministring Spirits* that attend the Throne of God, as the *Grandees*, or chief Nobles of Kings stand round their Thrones on Earth.

AND on this occasion, I cannot help taking notice, how unluckily he instances in the *Chaldæan* sense of the word—*Trin. of the Gent.* p. 359. in order to recommend the application of it to the Deity.

“WE have (says he) no noun for this (viz. רבים) “ in our language. The “ *Chaldæans* render it *magnates*; it expresses “ magnificence, amplitude, it is applied “ to

64 DISCOURSE I.

“to that inexpressible condition.” &c.—
I say, if he would here insinuate that this high idea, not to be expressed in our language, is conveyed in the Chaldee רב, he must have forgot that the word in that language seldom arises to any higher sense than *principes*, *præfecti*, &c. And is applied to subjects rather than to monarchs, or supreme powers.

MR H. has one argument more for the propriety of *Rubbin* in his application of it, which he often inculcates, viz. that “The Heathen had their *Rubbin* also.” *Remarks*, p. 370. And, indeed, one would imagine upon reading several passages * interspersed in his writings, that he had made this matter exceeding clear, —that

* “Since the first exhibition at Paradise, the Heathens “made these three the emblems of their Trinity, The “Ox, Fire, the Lyon, Light, the Eagle, Spirit; which “they, as I have shewed, called *Rubbin*.” *Glor. and Grav.* p. 118.

“*Philo* knew the Fire, Light, and Spirit, were called “*Rubbin*, or said to be *sicut*, like *Rubbin*. And must “know that they had been worshipped under that name; “so takes them, or his supposed potentates in them, for “those the *Cherubim* represented. *ibid.* p. 119.

“The inanimate agents, which the Heathen and some “of the late *Jews* called *Rubbin*, and worshipped, and “are similitudes also of the great ones,” &c. *Remarks*, p. 371.

—that the Heathens not only worshipped, but had also a Temple to the *Rubbin*, by the name of *Rubbin* *. Yet when we come to look at the place in his *Names and Attributes*, &c. which he so often refers us to, viz. p. 359. we find the proof of this important article rests upon two texts, neither of which is cited by him at length, but only referred to, viz. *Amos* iii. 15. in which he finds *בתי רבים*, and *Cant.* vii. 4. which he thinks should be read *בית רבים* to make it sense, whereas it is wrote *בת רבים*.

* “ I have shewed in the *Names and Attributes of the Trinity of the Gentiles*, that the Heathen had a temple to the names under the title of *בתי רבים* *Magnates*.” *Glor. and Grav.* p. 119.—“ The image is frequently called by the same name as what it represents. But the Heathens, as you may see in the *Names and Attributes of the Trinity of the Gentiles*, called the Names *Rubbin* without the כ, and had a double Temple unto them.” *Remarks*, p. 379.

† This I presume to be his meaning, but cannot be sure it is so. The text he refers to runs thus —“ Thy neck is as a tower of ivory, thine eyes like the fish pools in *Heshbon*, by the gate of *Bathrabbim*.” *בת רבים*. But as he makes no observations on this text, and only thinks it might be to his purpose, I need not enquire any further into it here; and shall only say, I can scarce think there was any Heathen temple at *Heshbon* when this book was written.

66 DISCOURSE I.

BUT the two words **בתים רבים** as found together in *Amos*, seemed sufficient to him; for he thought, as may be inferred from his manner of citing the text, it was enough to say they were mentioned there. *Rubbin* would carry it's own authority: And *Beth* being used for a *Temple* as well as an *House*, and *Bethim* *Rubbin* being inserted in his Catalogue of Heathen Temples, would pass with little difficulty for a *Temple* to the *Rubbin*. And whereas the word in *Amos* is plural **בתים** (printed in his works **ביתים**) he is he pleased to conceive that it consisted of two divisions under one roof, like the Temple of God at *Jerusalem* (though I do not remember *that* was ever called **ביתים** but only **בית**), and so styles it “a double Temple to the *Rubbin*.” (*Remarks*, p. 379.) And “a plural Temple to their *Rubbin*.” (*Use of Reason Recovered*, p. 211.)

THIS may serve as an example of the nature of the evidence, and of the method of proof whereby Mr *H.* endeavoured to establish the certainty of several other Heathen temples in his *Trin. of the Gen.* and particularly those of **בית שן**, p. 436.

החרף

upon CHERUBIM. 67

החרף, p. 439. and בית הקיץ, p. 440. which he says are mentioned along with this in *Amos* iii. 15.

THE whole text runs thus,

“ IN that day that I shall visit the transgressions of *Israel*, upon him I will also visit the altars of *Bethel*, and the horns of the altar shall be cut off, and fall to the ground.

“ AND I will smite (בית החרף) the winter-house, with (בית הקיץ) the summer-house; and (בתי השן) the houses of ivory, and (בתים רבים) the great houses shall have an end, saith the Lord.”

BUT although this verse hath furnished Mr *H.* with three Heathen temples besides *that* to *Rubbin*, yet I think Mr *Romaine* hath not judged it proper to acknowledge any of them (except *Bethsan* mentioned in other texts) in his *Index of proper Names* in Scripture; though *that* to *Rubbin*, could it have been made out, would have seemed so material to Mr *H.*'s cause, that he would scarce have omitted it.

THE reasons alledged by Mr *H.* for making temples of them, will be found in his explanation of בית שן, p. 438.—

68 DISCOURSE I.

“ As we have no account of any subject
 “ making a house of ivory, nor any prince
 “ except *Solomon* ; and as we have no men-
 “ tion of any who had any *summer-houses*,
 “ nor of any who had any *winter-house*,
 “ except *Jer. xxxvi. 22.*—*Now the King*
 “ *sat in the winter-house.*—And as most
 “ of the rest are but accidentally mention-
 “ ed, and *these* on purpose, and as this
 “ and others are found joined with other
 “ places and instruments of *idolatry*, *Amos*
 “ *iii. 15.* *I must take this word in this*
 “ *sense*, and the others, *as Temples.*”

Now without enquiring whether בתי
 השן should not be according to his expli-
 cation of בתיים a double or a plural tem-
 ple to the year, and consequently not
 the same with בית שן, 1 *Sam. xxxi. 10.*
 and 2 *Sam. xxi. 12.* Without enquiring
 into his reason * for interpreting שן of the
 year,

* “ I think (says he) there are two ideas taken from the
 “ teeth. Not from the two setts, one above, and another
 “ below, but the first, as they are the only parts of man
 “ which cast and renew. I think *that* complex idea is
 “ taken from them and carried to the year. To be the
 “ giver of teeth, would be too small an epithet. To
 “ have the rule over the teeth of wild beasts or weapons,
 “ might have been considerable. But this word is seldom
 “ used for them. But to renew the year, and all the
 “ consequences,

upon CHERUBIM. 69

year, or *Bethsan*, in *Samuel*, of a temple, because the body of *Saul* was fixed as a trophy on the walls thereof, (though it is known to be the name of a town, *Josh.* xvii. 11. *Judg.* i. 27. 1 *Chron.* vii. 29.)—It may seem sufficient to obviate his argument in behalf of these four temples, with another taken from the same topicks.

Viz. As we have no account in Scripture of a temple to the year, but have accounts of *Solomon's*, and also of *Abab's*, houses of ivory; and as we have no mention of any temple to winter, but find mention made in *Jeremiah*, of the king's winter-house, from whence we may reasonably infer he had a summer-house too, as *Ehud*, King of *Eglon*, had a summer parlour; and as we find no mention made of any temples to *Rubbin*, but can make no doubt but that there were dwelling-houses

F 3 of

“consequences, renew the seasons, fruits, and also ripen
“and cast them, &c. would be an high attribute.” *Trin.*
Gent. p. 437.

Mr *Holloway's* account of the matter is, that the *Philistines* had a temple, “perhaps of ivory, which they called
“*Beth-Shan*, dedicated, doubtless, to the power of the
“*Airs*, which cast the teeth of animals.” *Originals*,
Vol. I. p. 199.

70 DISCOURSE I.

of great persons, or houses comparatively great, and magnificent, either of which would be termed (as properly at least as in Mr *H.*'s construction *) **בתי רבים**, therefore we must presume, till better proof can be given to the contrary, that these were houses belonging to men, and not temples to heathen Divinities: and consequently we judge we have better authority from the common rendering of this passage in *Amos*, than Mr *H.* hath given for his new explication of the place.

I SHOULD also observe, that the ancient versions are so far from favouring Mr *H.*'s sense of this text, that instead of *great houses*, they have *many houses*. The Greek has *εἰρηοὶ οἶκοι πολλοί*. And the *Arabick*, if the translation is just, *domus aliæ permultæ*. *Kimchi*'s note on the place is to this effect — “The word **רבים** in this place signifies *many in number*, or the sense “may be great in structure, viz. *palaces*.”

In

* I put in this *salvo*, because whether it be interpreted of *houses of great men*, or *temples of Rubbim*, it should, in either of those senses, have been wrote **בתי רבים**. For though in *regimine* the *forma absoluta* is sometimes put for the *construeta*, yet this is not to be supposed wantonly, or at pleasure.

upon CHERUBIM. 71

In which latter sense it will correspond with God's threatnings by this very Prophet, *chap. vi. 11.* to smite *הבית הגדול* the great house, with breaches, and the little house *הבית החטון* with clefts.

HAVING now fully examined this text in *Amos*, I must not suppress an intimation that Mr *H.* hath dropped in his chapter upon *Bethim Rubbim*, (*Trin. of the Gent. p. 359.*) as if he had more evidence in store for his construction of *Rubbim*, and which he reserved for a further support of his notion concerning the propriety of applying this word to the Divine Persons *. All therefore I can say is, that by what he hath published (and I believe I have brought together all the material passages relating to it in his whole works), it should not

F 4

seem

* After a short encomium on *Rubbim*, p. 359. which he says " is applied to that inexpressible condition, that " as in the shadow which was their object,"—(I suppose he means the Heathens object)—" it dwells in each of the " three Persons, *John i. 16. Ephes. i. 23. Colos. i. 19.* " and ii. 9. *For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the " Godhead bodily.*"—He adds immediately—" I cannot in this compass attempt this. I intend it a further consideration. I shall let it stand here as they " render it."—And then he proceeds to the texts above examined.

72 DISCOURSE I.

seem as if more could be said to recommend it.

I HOPE (for I shall now put an end to this article) it hath been shewn that probably כְּרוּבִים is no compound word; or were that otherwise, yet רִיבִים not being used in Scripture at all, nor רִיב used to signify a *great One*, nor רִיבִים nor רִיב used as *epithets* peculiar to God, I may safely leave it to the judicious reader to determine, whether what Mr *H.* hath advanced upon *Rub* and *Rubbim* (and I think I have no where misrepresented him), be a sufficient foundation for his many and positive assertions about those words, and for his using the latter as *the proper stile* of the Divine Persons in all parts of his works, where it will serve his hypothesis, or his argument in hand, to use that term for them. And whether he has any better authority for doing so, than what he gives us, *Vol. VI. p. 410.* “WE SAY the “covenant was before the Creation, and “between *the Rubbim*, so *Aleim*.” And whether his zeal for establishing the use of this title, be not exerted purely for the sake of establishing his derivation of *Che-rubim*; and lastly, whether they who
do

upon **CHERUBIM.** 73

do not implicitly receive all his assertions as true, may not justly suspect that he was led more by fancy to his notion of *a Covenant in the Cherubim*, than by any evidence of such a covenant arising from the force and Scripture usage of either of the words **אלהים** or **רבים**.

S E C T.

74 DISCOURSE I.

S E C T. IV.

Cherub and Cherubim not duly distinguished from each other by Mr H. and his followers.

BUT there is another difficulty to be cleared up before this new construction of *Cherubim* can take place, and that is the application of the word כְּרוּבִים in the plural to a representation, or an exhibition, which, however multiform it may have been, yet when it is considered distinctly, and by itself, *as being one*, is always called in Scripture כְּרוּב in the singular; whereas *Cherubim* is never used but when two or more such representations or *Cherubs* are mentioned together.

IT is from *Ezekiel* only, that Mr H. takes the description. It is from him alone that the figure is said to be a compound
of

upon CHERUBIM. 75

of four animals *, and to have three heads (according to Mr C.) or four heads (according to others) and four visages. For nothing more is said of the figures on the Mercy-Seat, than that each of them had wings and a visage.

Now what is it that *Ezekiel* calls the *Cherubim*? Not *each figure*, or living-creature, with the four heads and visages, but *the four figures* or living-creatures that supported the Throne. See *Ezek.* x. 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20. Whereas, when he speaks of any of these four living creatures separately, and in contradistinction

* “ That this was the figure of the *Cherubim* we learn “ from the Prophet *Ezekiel*.”—*Proposals for printing Mr H.’s Works*, p. 23.

“ From the Visions of *Ezekiel* he collects that the “ form of the *Cherubim* was *one figure*, with four heads or “ visages.” *Letter to a Bishop*, p. 45.

“ It pleased God to exhibit to *one* of his Prophets, “ *Ezekiel*, in a vision, at different times, the figure of “ those emblems which he has in two several places, “ Chap. 1st, and xth, carefully recorded. The description “ of the creatures seen in this vision by *Ezekiel*, is so full, “ and so anxiously, and laboriously given, that there is no “ mistaking some of the great lines of it.”

—“ Knowing thus from *Ezekiel* the form of the *Cherubim*,” &c.

Thoughts concerning Religion, p. 108.

76 DISCOURSE I.

tion from the others, then he calls it only *Cherub*.

“Go in between the wheels, even under the *Cherub*, and fill thy hands with coals of fire from between the *Cherubim*.” *Ibid.* ver. 2.

“AND one *Cherub* stretched forth his hand from between the *Cherubim*.” *Ibid.* ver. 7.

So again, when he speaks of *Cherubim* in his temple, chap. xli. He gives the plural *Cherubim* to an indefinite number, ver. 20, 25. And the singular *Cherub* when he speaks of *any one* of them.

“AND it was made with *Cherubims* and Palm-trees, so that a Palm-tree was between a *Cherub* and a *Cherub*. And every *Cherub* had two faces.” ver. 18.

THE same distinction is preserved by *Moses*, in his account of the *Cherubim* on the ark.

Exod. xxv. “THOU shalt make two *Cherubims* of gold.—And make one *Cherub* on the one end, and the other *Cherub* on the other end, even of the Mercy-seat shall ye make the *Cherubims* on the two ends thereof.” ver. 18, 19, 20.

AND

upon CHERUBIM. 77

AND this is a rule which holds, as I take it, throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, viz. that כְּרוּבִים is never used but when two or more *Cberubs* are spoken of. See 1 *Kings* vi. 24.—and vii. 29.—and viii. 6.—2 *Chron.* iii. 7.—and v. 8. and other places.

WHEN therefore Mr C. after having described one of the living creatures with four visages from *Ezekiel*, in the passage cited from him above, added—"THIS "was named *Cberubim*," he presumed a little too hastily upon that which will not be granted him without good proof.

THE defender of Mr H.'s plan has stated the point justly, saying, *p.* 50.—
 "What does *Ezekiel* mean when he says,
 "I knew that they were the Cherubims?
 "The image as compounded of four
 "heads and one body, is called a *Cberub*.
 "*Ezekiel* sees four of these representa-
 "tions, and says, he knew them to be
 "*Cberubim*."

AND it is in this sense, I think, that other interpreters have understood the place. The Prophet, indeed, twice says in this chapter, (viz. chap. x.) "This is
 "the living Creature (הַיָּצֵר הַחַיָּה) that I
 "saw

78 DISCOURSE I.

“saw by the river *Chebar*,” ver. 15. and 20. referring to *the appearance or cherubic form*, which was *one and the same* in each of the figures, and in each vision, as is explained in the 21st and 22d verses. And by which the Prophet knew **כִּי כְרוּבִים הֵמָּה**. An expression evidently relating to all the four figures or representations, for as it follows, *every one* had four faces apiece, and *every one* four wings.

AND although this distinction between the singular **כְּרוּב** expressing one figure or representation, and the plural **כְּרוּבִים** expressing two or more such figures, hath not been always made by the LXX *, nor always duly kept up in the other versions

* *Suidas*, upon the word *Cherubim*, tells us—**Χερουβειμ** ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνίκων διαδοχῶς, πλεονασμικῶς δὲ διατὰ ἰ. As if **Χερουβειμ** were the proper plural in Greek. Yet in the common copies of the LXX, we find the words **Χερουβειμ**, **Χερουβιμ**, and **Χερουβιν** used indifferently; and it is by one or other of these, that they sometimes render the singular **כְּרוּב**, as in 1 *Kings* vi. 24, 25. and 2 *Chron.* iii. 11, 12. Though the *Alexandrian* copy hath **Χερουβ**, the singular, in these texts.—And sometimes they use the word *without an article*, some with the *masculine*, at other times with the *neuter* article; as **τὸς δύο Χερουβιμ**, *Exod.* xxv. 19. **Οἱ Χερουβιμ ἐκτίνοντες**, *ibid.* xx. **τὰ Χερουβιμ**, *Gen.* iii. 24. (subintellige **ζῶα** vel **πνευματὰ**. *Drusius*.) **Δύο Χερουβιμ χρυσα**, *Exod.* xxv. 18.

upon **CHERUBIM.** 79

fions *, or in common language, yet as it hath been always preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures, it is too material in our present argument, to be slighted or passed over.

MR *Romaine* has observed on the word in the singular, 2 *Sam.* xxii. 11. “ *Legendum Cherub, non Cherubim.*” *Nom. prop. Interp* †. And Mr *H.* himself not only

* Many of the Latin writers constantly use *Cherubinus*. “ *Sed latina declinatione sunt Cherubus aut Cherubi non Cherubini.* — Quamquam vulgò *Cherubinum* usurpant pro *Cherub* vel *Cherubum*. Miror & improbo.” *Drus. Notæ majores in Exod.*

“ Nos scire debemus singulari numero esse *Cherub* generis masculini, & plurali ejusdem generis *Cherubim.*” *Hieron. in Ezek. x.*

Numero singulari *Cherub*, plurali autem *Cherubim* dicitur, & est nomen generis masculini. Sed Græca consuetudo, neutro genere *Cherubim* posuit. *Beda in Ezek.*

† As it is read *Cherub* in all the Hebrew copies, I do not well know Mr *Romaine*’s view in this short remark: unless it was designed as a correction of the version in our reading *Psalms*, xviii. 10. where the same passage occurs which he refers to in 2 *Sam.* xxii. 11. viz. “ He rode up-
“ on the *Cherubims*,” (it should be *Cherub*, as in the Bible version of the *Psalms*) “ and did fly.”

The old English versions had it *Cherub* in *Samuel*, and *Cherubim* in the *Psalms*. For what reason I cannot conjecture. But our present Bible is now corrected throughout in regard to the singular *Cherub*; though our translators, in order to preserve *Cherubim* the plural in it’s English dress, have

80 DISCOURSE I.

only allows the distinction, but contends for it *.

WHETHER he was, or his followers are, aware how much in reality his doctrine about the *Cberubim* is affected by this distinction doth not appear. But surely none of them have sufficiently attended to it in their versions, or explanations of the word. For though it were allowed, that the four visages belonging to each *cherubic* figure denote four animals, which may properly be called *Rubbin*, or chief among the creatures, and also that they may be proper

have still retained *Cherubims*, as if the word without the *s* were of the singular number. The French render the singular *Cherubin*, the plural *Cherubins*.

* "But what stands most in his (Mr Bedford's) way is
" I M to *Aleim* and *Cherubim*. And though he complains
" so much of breaking rules, he will not know the plural
" from the singular, nor that I M is the same with □
" which he knew not how to write, which is the infallible
" mark of the plural masculine, and is confirmed by his
" *Bythner Reg.* 31." — *Remarks*, p. 382.

Again—"Had not each *Cherub* a body of four bodies
" united, and four faces? Every one Animal or *Cherub* had
" four faces, so there were sixteen faces, four on each side."
Ibid. p. 376.—"Four (viz. Powerful ones) in each of
" the *Cberubim*, or in each *Cherub*." *Ibid.* p. 406.

"Each *Cherub* had the same four creatures joint, and
" their visages above, but they were so placed that one
" visage had the conduct of the wheel in one *Cherub*,
" another in another." *Ibid.* p. 377.

upon CHERUBIM. 81

proper emblems of the *Rubbim*, or the *great ones*, in the most eminent sense ; yet it must be asked, where it is, or in what text of the Bible that any *one* of these *cherubic* forms or compound creatures is called *Cherubim*? Or put it thus. If we are to be guided altogether in the construction of the word *Cherubim* wherever it occurs, ex. gr. *Gen. iii. 24.* by *Ezekiel's* visions, how can we understand it otherwise than he has taught us in his visions, *viz.* of a plurality of cherubic forms, each of which is compounded of four animals?

Now if these questions cannot be fairly and clearly answered, and my distinction above given should prove a true observation, what I shall infer from thence is as follows.—That *Cherubim* in the Hebrew is always the plural of the compound word *Cherub* (if it really be, as they say, a compound word), and not the plural of *Rub*, the noun said to be compounded with *che*. So that it doth never signify, and ought never to be translated by *sicut Rubbim*, or *sicut Magnates*; but it only expresses a plurality of figures, each of which is *Cherub*, or like *the great One*. And therefore the versions of it by *the images of Rubbim*, or

82 DISCOURSE I.

the *similitudes* of the *great Ones*, as Mr C. rendered it, are by no means just. For if *Cberub* be the image of *Rub*, the *likeness* of the *great One*; *Cberubim* the plural, will mean, the images of *Rub*, the *similitudes* of the *great One*.

BUT this inaccuracy of expression in respect of the *word*, *Cberubim*, (which, indeed, is also an error in the representation of the *thing* under enquiry) is common to all the writers I have seen on the same side. Nay, some of them are more inaccurate in this point than Mr C. as the editors for instance, who render it by the *similitude* of the *great Ones*; *image* of the *great Ones* *. And Mr Romaine, who interprets it, *Nom. prop. int.* p. 98. thus,

“כְּרוּב. Similitudo magnatis. כְּרוּבִים
“Idem, sed pluralis numeri, *similitudo* vel
“*figura magnatum* †:” which is altogether

as

* See their proposals for reprinting Mr H.'s works, and the translators version of texts quoted by Mr H. in Latin, as 1 *Sam.* iv. 4 and 1 *Chron.* xiii 6. Where what he gave, unintelligibly enough, as a version of יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוּבִים *insidentis sicut magnates*, (*Glor. and Grav.* his own edition, p. 152.) The new translator gives in English, “Who dwelleth in the *image* of the *great Ones*.” Vol. VI. p. 161.

† Mr R. by saying *Idem sed plur. num.* means, I presume,

upon CHERUBIM. 83

as improper, as if one were to translate חַמְנִים, *Isa.* xxvii. 9. by *An image of suns*, instead of *sun-images*, or *imagines solis*, as it is rightly rendered *Trin.* of the *Gent.* p. 279. and p. 39. of Mr *H.*'s own edition.

AND Mr *H.* himself, though he commonly gives it by *sicut Rubbim*, yet once or twice he translates it as the Gentlemen abovementioned do; as may be seen in his own edition of *Hebr. Writ. Perf.* p. 419. where he explains *Cherubim*, in a parenthesis, by the *similitude* of the *great Ones*.

G 2

AND

sume, that it is a plural proper name, compounded of *che* quasi, and *Rubbim*, as *Cherub* is of *Cbe* and *Rub*. And that it is not the plural of *Cherub* considered as a noun of two numbers, but is a distinct proper name, of the same form, or of a like composition with *Cherub*. For he says —“ *Nomen hoc est proprium istius figuræ quam primo Deus Adamo revelavit, & postea Moses & Solomon in Sancto Sanctorum super arcam Testimonii collocarunt.*” And so he proceeds to speak of כְּרוּבִים as *one* emblematical figure, and explains it by *one* of the four *cherubic* forms in *Ezekiel*. By which means, if I mistake not, he shifts his plural *Cherubim* into the place of the Scripture *Cherub*. And therefore I must recur to the question put above, viz. Where does he find *Cherubim* used in Hebrew as a proper name for the figure he gives an account of under that name? As being, “ *Unum tantum Corpus cui quatuor sunt impositæ facies.*” &c. ?

84 DISCOURSE I.

AND if there be any *one* text in the Bible immediately relative to this subject, which it was of more than ordinary consequence to render with accuracy and caution, as being the principal passage from whence Mr *H.*'s idea and construction of *Cherubim* is taken, and on which he builds his hypothesis concerning the form of the Cherubim at Paradise, and of their representations in the tabernacle, it is *Ezek. x. 20.* where the Prophet says—"This is "the living creature I saw הַחַת the God "of *Israel*, and I knew כִּי כְרוּבִים "הֵמָּה."

Now had our translators taken upon them to render *Cherubim* in this place by *Angels*, or *ministring Spirits*, though in doing so they would only have followed a notion almost universally received, loud complaints would probably have been made (as there have been on other occasions) of their giving us their own private misconstructions instead of Scripture; and of their attempting to father upon the Prophet a notion for which they had no authority *from him*. Yet Mr *H.* may without fear of censure venture to fix his own private exposition, though it was never heard

heard of before, upon this important passage, and to build great things on that exposition. “Hoc animal quod vidi *subter* “(vice) *Elabim Israel*—& cognovi quod “*sicut Rubbim ipsi.*” *Glor. and Grav.* his own edition, p. 152. And his translator may take the like liberty for the use of the English reader—“This is the creature “which I saw under (a substitute of) the “*Aleim* of Israel,—and I knew that they “were the *image of the great Ones.*” New edition, p. 162.

BUT is it, as yet, clear or certain that we ought to interpret *Cberubim* mentioned here by *Ezekiel* in this sense? Is not this the same kind of presumptive decision of the point in question, that our translators might have been justly charged with, if they had rendered *Cberubim* here by *Angels*?

THE Prophet has applied a word, supposed to be well known to the Hebrews when he wrote, from the frequent mention made of it in their Law and History, to the living creatures which he saw in his visions. When he speaks of any *one* of the *four living creatures*, chap. i. 5. he terms it *Cberub*; and the four living crea-

86 DISCOURSE I.

tures *Cherubim*. As *Moses* and the other sacred Historians had termed *one* figure in the Holy of Holies *Cherub*, two or more of them *Cherubim*. But this is all that can be justly and fairly deduced from his use of the word. He says nothing of *Cherubs* being expressive of the *great One*; or if he had even said *that it was so in its signification*, still it would not have followed that *Cherubim* the plural, as he uses it, would have signified (what they translate it) *The image of the great Ones*; it would only in that case have signified, *The images of the great One*, or a plurality of representations, each of which was *Cherub*, *The similitude of the great One*.

IT may be said, indeed, that as *one* of the emblematical animals in the compound image, viz. *The Bull*, is called a *Cherub* in *Ezekiel* the xth; and as each of the other animals in the same compound image may be considered as representing a *Rub*, a *great One*, and therefore might be properly termed a *Cherub* too; so all the four in junction may justly be stiled in the plural *Cherubim*.

AND this is the light in which the word seems to have been considered by
the

the ingenious writer of *Thoughts concerning Religion*, when he says, (*p.* 19. of the *Edinburgh edition*)—"There must be a conjunction of *three* emblems in *one* to represent what was intended."

THESE he calls in opposition to idols, "The lawful emblems first proposed by the Deity. And adds, —That the word in the Hebrew used to signify the image or the representation of the Deity, carried about as an idol, is *plural also*, viz. *Teraphim*, though relating only to one image or idol."

WHENCE we are given to understand, that *Cberubim* plural is properly applied to one compound image.

I AM unwilling to say any thing that looks like finding fault with a writer whom I so much esteem; and in whom, I think, no faults are to be found, but where he takes things for granted on Mr *H.*'s sole authority; which has led him often to endeavour the support of what hath no good foundation, though he always does it handsomely, and as plausibly as the matter will bear.

HERE he takes for granted, that *Cberubim* signifies the image or representation

88 DISCOURSE I.

of the Deity, and that the word is plural because three emblems in *one* were required to represent what was intended.

To which I answer, that this shall be allowed with all the just inferences to be drawn from it, after it hath been first shewed, that *Cberubim* is at *any time* applied in Scriptue to this compound of four figures, exclusive of any other compound figure, or emblems of the same kind, i. e. that *Cberubim* and *Cberub* are indifferently used for one and the same representation of the four principal animals combined; though at the same time it is owned, that *Cberub* is once used for one of those animals, viz. the Bull, in distinction from the other three.

THAT the Divine Covenant for the Redemption of man was the thing to be represented, all these Gentlemen, I think, are unanimously agreed. That three emblems at least should, on this supposition, be in conjunction, *to represent what was intended* (as our author says), will not be disputed. They give a reason why these conjunct emblems could not be called *Cbe-Elahim*, (which reason shall be considered hereafter). And they give another reason
why

why they might nevertheless be properly stiled *Cherubim*, in the sense of *likeness of the great Ones*. Now my objection to this last reason is, that they are *not stiled Cherubim*, but only *Cherub*. And therefore are not, as they say, representative of *Rubbin*.

IF it should be said, that although the name (*Cherub*) may in strictness denote nothing more than the *unity* of the Essence; yet *the thing* (the emblems in conjunction) denotes *the persons* in the Essence, and is expressive of the *Rubbin*; all that I shall need to reply, is, that such a concession will yield all that I am aiming at in this article, viz. that their hypothesis concerning the *Cherubim*, cannot be supported upon the *Scripture usage of the word*. And I shall hereafter consider, how far it is proved from the form or other circumstances of the appearance that is described.

As for the supposed illustration that is offered from *Teraphim*, no stress can reasonably be laid upon it. For though the word is applied to one image or idol, (as appears from the use of it, 1 *Sam.* xix. 13, 16.) yet that the image or idol, to which the word is so applied, was a compound

90 DISCOURSE I.

pound of more figures or emblems than one (like *Cherub*), and for that reason called *Teraphim* in the *plural*, is more than hath been, or perhaps can be shewn. What Mr *H.* tells us of *Teraphim* being a copy from the original exemplar of *Cherubim*, exhibited to the Patriarchs, and consequently a representation of the Deity, is mere conjecture. Had it been the same kind of compound figure with that which is said to be the image of the Deity, it should have had a singular *Teraph* to answer to the singular *Cherub*: and *Teraphim* would have meant a plurality of such compound figures as *Cherubim* doth. But as *Teraph* is never once mentioned, we cannot be sure that *Teraphim* hath a plural meaning, though it have a plural termination, like other Hebrew words, as פְּנִים, and חַיִּים, &c. which are always plural in termination, though they are most frequently used in a singular sense. Or if the plurality of the number in *Teraphim* was founded on some plurality in the *thing*, as the duplicity of features in פְּנִים, or the like; yet no further conclusion can be drawn from thence till we are able, not merely to fancy, but to shew
on

on good grounds wherein that plurality consisted.

IT may be asked perhaps, why it should not be with *Cherub* and its plural, as it is with the words used for what *Cherub* and *Cherubim* are said to represent, viz. *Eloah* and *Elohim*, which are used and translated in our Bibles indifferently, and stand, by my own concessions, for the same Being, expressed in the singular, *God*? nay, if אלהים the plural, is sometimes rendered singular *God*, and sometimes plural *Gods*, Why should any difficulty be made of allowing the same liberty of interpretation with respect to כרובים? Especially since there is as good authority from the LXX, as far as the authority of that version goes, for the one as for the other; seeing כרוב is rendered therein by Χερουβιμ, as well as by Χερυβ, in like manner as אלהים is therein rendered by Θεοι, as well as by Θεός?

To which I reply, that the case is not the same, because the Scripture usage of the words is not the same.

כרובים and רבים are neither of them found to carry a singular sense with their plural termination, as *Elohim* frequently doth.

92 DISCOURSE I.

doth. Neither are they joined with verbs in the singular, or applied to individuals as *that* is, and as some other words occasionally are, as **בְּעֵלִים** and **אֱדֹנִים**.

ELOHIM is also variously applied to angels, judges, magistrates, and false gods as well as to the true God: And receives a translation singular or plural according to such application, i. e. according to the nature or number of the persons or things of which the context requires it to be interpreted. And although Mr *H. avers that אֱלֹהִים is always plural* (see *Remarks*, his own edition, p. 49.); yet to this aversment, I oppose St *Paul's* authority, who quotes and applies an instance of *Elohim* from *Psal. xlv. 6.* to the second Divine Person, or Son of God *only*, *Heb. i. 8.* And we find *Ashtoreth* (אֱלֹהֵי) the goddess of the *Zidonians*. *Chemosh* (אֱלֹהֵי) the god of the *Moabites*; and *Milcom* (אֱלֹהֵי) the god of the children of *Ammon*, *1 Kings xi. 33.*

AND I might safely enough abide by their own rules of interpretation, for justifying the distinction I have made between the plural words *Elohim* and *Cherubim*.

As

As first. If according to Mr Goussset's maxim (approved by Mr H. *Remarks*, p. 129.) we ought to *examine each word in the Hebrew Scriptures by its usage in itself, with rules, &c.* Then the Scripture usage of these two words will fall under distinct and separate rules, with regard to their construction under their plural terminations. For the singular construction of the one under a plural termination in some instances, can be no sure precedent for the singular construction of the other under the like termination, any more than it can be a precedent for the singular construction of רַבִּים, or of any other word which is found always plural in sense when it is so in termination.

SECONDLY, though there are some instances in the LXX version, of Χερουβείμ for כְּרוּב, I may answer with respect to all such instances, as Mr Romaine admonishes us with respect to one of them in 2 Sam. xxii. 11. "*Legendum Cherub, non Cherubim*" *Nom. prop. Int.* And support this answer with observing from Mr Goussset and Mr H. "*that we are not to depend on the LXX or other greek versions* (*Remarks*, p. 129.) nor to

94 DISCOURSE I.

to allow of any authority in any translation by fallible men to supersede the original.

AND lastly, to conclude this article, Mr *H.* often cautions us to be rigorously exact in making our translations of Hebrew words to correspond in number with the original, as if great matters did always depend upon it: and has treated one of his opponents with very great severity *, for having put a singular for a plural in interpreting these appearances of the *Cherubim* in *Ezekiel*.

Now therefore his friends have the less reason to expect that they should be indulged in using *Cherub* and *Cherubim* indifferently, for the same compound image, as may best suit their present occasions and purposes. All they can reasonably expect is,

* See his own edit. of *Remarks* p. 110. The editors have prudently dropped the expression in their edition, because the reflexion bears equally hard upon our Translators who shewed Mr *Bedford* the example; not to say that one of Mr *H.*'s best friends (*the defender of his plan*) has fallen under the same *premunire*, by rendring the same word דְמוּת by *likeness* for *likenesses* in quoting *Ezek. x. 22.* (*Def. of the Plan.* p. 50.) But above all, Mr *H.*'s severity in this case is very unjust, because דְמוּת the word they have rendered by *likeness* is a regular singular, and doth not appear any where to be a plural.

is, that they may claim their option whether they will abide by the singular or by the plural word in their exposition of this Hieroglyphic of the Divine Persons in covenant.

IF they chuse to abide by *Cherubim*, making it a compound of *Che*, and the plural *Rubim*, in order to render it—*The likeness of the great ones*, emblematically representing the Divine Persons in Covenant, (in which light the editors put the word in their proposals*) then it is desired they would shew where it is the word is so used as to admit of this interpretation. Not in *Ezek.* for in his visions *Cherubim* is never mentioned otherwise than as the plural of *Cherub* or *Cherubic figure*, signifying a number of such figures: and is nowhere used for a plurality of persons emblematically represented in one figure †.

Not

* THE faces of these creatures joined in one body made up the compound figure called the *Cherubim*, which name in Hebrew signifies the *similitude*, *representation*, or *picture* of the great ones, from כ *sicut*, *like*, and רב *Rabim*, or *Rubim*, the great the mighty ones, from *Rab* or *Rub*. *Proposals for printing Mr H.'s Works*, p. 23.

† MR H. says "as there were *Cherubim* to exhibit "the three, so there was a *Cherub*, the likeness of the great " one

96 DISCOURSE I.

Not in any other part of Scripture, because there is no pretence of authority to expound *Cherubim* in the sense last mentioned, but what is founded on *Ezekiel's* visions.

AND on the other hand, if they abide by *Cherub*, the only name given by *Ezekiel* to any *one* of those compound figures, and say it represents the Divine Persons in covenant, how will they prove *the thing* from *the name*, or indeed reconcile *the name* to *the thing*?

IF *Rub.* were evidently one of the Divine Titles whereby the Deity is distinguished from other beings, then *Cherub* might be said to be an image or representation of the Divine Being. But a plurality of persons in this case could not be inferred from *the word*, which under this construction would express the unity. And that a Trinity of persons, said to be represented in the exhibition called *Cherub*, cannot be inferred from *the word itself*, is all that I am at present concerned to observe.

AGAIN, though *Cherub* is the word always used in *Ezekiel* for the four animals
in

“one to represent one.” *Remarks*, p. 115. But he should have told us, where it is he found *Cherubim* used for an exhibition of the three, as *Cherub* is used for one.

in junction, which Mr C. calls the *quadruple Compound* (*Anf. to Obs.* p. 65.) yet it is sometimes used, as in Ch. xli. ver. 18, 19. for the *double Compound* according to Mr C. (*ibid*) which Mr H. stiles the *double Cherub*, and the *coupled Cherub*. (*Use of Reas. rec.* Part I. p. 228 and 232.) But the prophet makes no distinction of *coupled*, or *double*, or *quadruple Cherub*, but gives the same name indifferently to each of these compounded figures, and once he uses it for *the Bull* only, in the quadruple Compound, ch. x. ver 14. But he never uses it of any *triple* compound, or *triform* emblem. On all which accounts, *Cherub* doth not seem by any means to be a proper word, whereby the *three* Divine Covenanters should be expressed.

So that after all, this distinction of the Persons, which these Gentlemen aim at establishing in this Hieroglyphic, is not to be gathered from *the word itself*, considered in it's usage and application in Scripture either as *singular* or as *plural*; but must be made out, if it can be made out, from the form or other circumstances given of the living creatures in *Ezekiel's* visions.

98 DISCOURSE I.

AND this being the other branch of Mr C.'s account of *Cherubim*, viz. that which relates to the *Cherubic Form*, and the design of it, shall be the subject of my next enquiry.

SECT.

S E C T. V.

Mr H.'s Hypothesis not supported by Ezekiel's description of a Cherubic form.

TWO points Mr C. asserts which are new, and peculiar to Mr H.'s system.

1. ONE is, that the *Cherubim* described by *Ezekiel* in the first and tenth chapters, were emblematical exhibitions of the Persons in the Trinity, or the *Aleim* under covenant.

2. THE other is, that the man's visage was in some peculiar manner joined to or united with the Lyon's visage, to denote the Incarnation, or Union of the Manhood with the second Person in the Trinity *.

H 2

THESE

* Mr C's *Serm.* p. 13. Mr H.—'s *Introd. to M. Prin.* p. 281. *Use of R.* Part I. p. 61.

100 DISCOURSE I.

THESE are great matters in themselves, deserve a close attention, and call for a diligent examination, that we may know whether they can be made appear from *Ezekiel's* visions or not.

I. AND first, let us examine what has been offered in proof of the *Cherubim* being an emblematical representation of the *Aleim*.

MR H. in his *Mos. sine Princ.* after fifty pages spent upon the word *Aleim*, concludes that head with this remarkable period, p. 127.

“ BUT to put the matter out of doubt,
 “ what it was that the word *Aleim* ex-
 “ presses; what it was that *Moses* alone,
 “ and *Moses* and the *Israelites* saw, when
 “ it is said they saw the *Aleim*; *Ezekiel*
 “ has by a description of the emblem, in
 “ clear words, fully shewed, chap. i. 1.
 “ *The Heavens* (the names) were opened,
 “ and אר אה I saw מראות (the instru-
 “ ments) the objects of vision, the *Aleim*.
 “ And chap. i. and chap. x. under the
 “ names of living creatures and *Cheru-*
 “ *bims*, and says, chap. x. 20. *This is the*
 “ *living creature which I saw תחת* under
 “ (M. for, instead of, in the place of) *the*
 “ *Aleim*

upon CHERUBIM. 101

“*Aleim of Israel*: which will be described
“under the head of *Cherubims*.”

IN like manner Mr *Romaine*. *Nom.*
Prop. Int. p. 99.

“CUI usui voluit Deus hanc figuram
“*inservire* Propheta nobis *plane ostendit*,
“*Ezek. i. 1.* Ubi dicit *illam fuisse me-*
“*dium per quod videre possimus Aleim*
“*מראות אלהים*. Et alibi. x. 20. *Hoc*
“*vivens* quod videre factus sum *substitutio*
“*Dei Israel* in flumine *Chebar*, & cognovi
“quod *Cherubim* ipsi. *Cherubim* ergo fu-
“erunt typus & repræsentatio quædam
“personarum sacrosanctæ Trinitatis hiero-
“glyphica officii personæ singuli in fœ-
“dore Gratiae, oculis demonstrans quid foret
“agendum pro redemptione hominum.”

HERE is now such clear and irrefra-
gable evidence, according to these Gentle-
men, as should leave no place for doubt
about the matter. And it leaves none, I
suppose, among those who have been
trained in Mr *H.*'s school, and are quali-
fied to discern *primo intuitu*, the (long la-
tent) evidence which he hath brought to
light by his *new*, and by them deemed
happy, constructions. Yet it ought not to
seem strange, if others who have not the

102 DISCOURSE I.

same quickness of apprehension, nor equal faith in his skill, do not only hesitate upon what are stiled his *plain proofs*, but take the liberty too of calling the validity of them in question.

MR H. tells us *, that “ מראה is a “term universally used for that species of “ emblems, which were constituted to shew “ the originals.” It may be the word used for such emblems; yet it may at other times be used for the simple *appearance* or *aspect* of a thing; as Ezek. i. 5. “ This “ was מראה their appearance; and ver. 13. “ מראה their appearance was like burning coals of fire, and like the appearance “ of lamps.” In these and the like passages it seems to be merely a term,
or,

* *Use of Reason Recovered*, p. 110. I give this passage here only to shew Mr H.’s sense of the import of the word: Though I think at the same time, that he made this remark from a text that will not support it, viz. Gen. ii. 9. *Every tree that is pleasant to the sight (למראה) and good for food.* This he renders “ Every “ tree desirable for the instrument of vision,” referring מראה to the tree as an emblem of some original, the knowledge of which was to be desired. But, as I take it, if מראה must here mean the instrument of vision, it must be understood of the eye; as appears from a parallel expression, Gen. iii. 6. “ The tree good for food, and pleasant “ to the eyes לעינים.”

or, if you will, *an instrument* of description, without retaining any emblematical import.

INDEED, when it is used to express an intire prophetick vision, or in the plural, a series of visions, (which is the case in the text under consideration) it will not be improperly stiled *an instrument*, by which something is revealed, or a *medium* through which something of a more abstruse or sublime nature is discovered, as far as it is intended to be made known thereby; or a *constituted emblem* of some original, the idea of which is more or less perfectly conveyed by, and couched under such adumbration. And every such extraordinary and supernatural impression on a prophet's mind or fancy, whether in *ecstasy* or in *dreams*, is termed in Hebrew *מראה*; in Chaldee *חזון* or *חזוא*, But the *subject matter* of such vision, or in Mr H's phrase, *the original* of such *emblem*, is not always to be gathered from, and determined by the noun Substantive that immediately follows *מראה* or *חזון*. As for instance, Gen. xlv. 2. *במראות הלילה*, in *the visions of the night*: This doth not mean their being representations or con-

104 DISCOURSE I.

stituted *emblems* of *night*, but *night-visions*, like that mentioned in *Daniel*, chap. xi. 19. בחזון די ליליא. So again in *Daniel's* recital of *Nebuchadnezzar's* dream, ver. 28. חזון ראשך *the visions of thy head*, are not to be understood of the king's head being the object matter of his dreams, but that his imagination, or his thoughts were employed by them in his sleep.

WHY may not therefore *visions of God* in *Ezek.* i. 1. be interpreted of visions from * *God*, or Divine visions imparted by him? especially as it follows in the very next verse, that *the hand of God was upon him*, *Ezek.* i. 2. And more especially as the same words occur, chap. viii. 3. in this sense. "The spirit lifted me up
" between the earth and the heaven, and
" brought me *in the visions of God* (במראות
" אלהים) to *Jerusalem*." i. e. The rapture and imaginary transportation from his house
in

* See several instances of this kind collected in *Glassius's* *Obj. Sacr.* p. 630, under his 30th Canon concerning the use of the genitive case. As *Isa.* liv. 13. למודי יהוה. *Edoſti Jehovah*, i. e. a *Jehovah*. *Hagg.* i. 13. במלאכות יהוה in *missione Jehovah* sc. a *Jehovah*. *Isa.* liii. 4. מכה אלהים smitten of *God*, viz. by *God*. Among which he cites this text, viz. מראות אלהים *Visione Dei*, h. e. a *Deo oblatus*.

in *Chaldæa*, ver. 1. to *Jerusalem* was in a vision, a vision *sent by God*, and not a delusion of *Satan*. (The like use of the word occurs, chap. xl. 2.) But how this can be understood in the sense which Mr *H.* and his followers put upon the same words in chap. i. 1. interpreting אלהים of the *object matter* of the vision, and מראה of the *instrument* by which, or the *medium* through which the *Aleim* appeared; or how the Prophet could be carried by the spirit in an *emblem*, in a *representation*, or in *Cherubim*, it belongs to themselves to explain, and to defend their explanation.

BUT secondly, when this expression in chap. i. 1. is construed in their own way, it is no *plain* proof of the point for which it is alledged, viz. that the *Cherubim* in the vision are the emblems of the *Aleim*. For מראות אלהים in this place, may be as well, if not better, understood of the other *appearances*, parts of the same vision, as *Cloud*, *Light*, *Fire*, the usual symbols of the Divine Presence; and, above all, of the *appearance* of the *Likeness* (מראה רמות) of the Glory of the Lord, ver. 28. which was above the firmament over the heads

106 DISCOURSE I.

heads of the *Cberubim* ver. 25, 26. and is called in the parallel texts Ch. viii. 4. and x. 19. the glory of the *Aleim* of *Israel* which was over the *Cberubim*, and ver. 20. This is the living creature that I saw *under* the *Aleim* of *Israel* by the river of *Cbebar*.

To obviate which last text they tell us that תחת here should not be rendred *under*, but means a *substitute*, *instead of*, in the place of *Aleim*. *Mos. sine Princ.* p. 127. *Glor. and Grav.* 162. *Defence of Mr H's Plan*, p. 41. and 47.

NOR will it be disputed, but that it will bear this sense with a corresponding context, as well as it doth bear the sense of *under*, when that rendring is most agreeable to the scope of the passage. In the 2d verse of this same chapter we have תחת הכרוב, and in the 8th verse יר אדם תחת כנפיהם. Now if any one were supposed to assert the meaning of the former to be the *substitute* of the *Cberub*, and of the latter to be the form of a man's hand *instead* of their wings, there is no way of disproving either, but from the context, which must always guide the meaning of words that have different significations. So it may be said in the passage before us,
that

that the propriety of rendring תחת by *under*, as in the two fore-mentioned instances, will scarce admit of a dispute, when we consider that God is represented as riding upon a *Cherub*, 2 Sam. xxii. 11. and Psal. xviii. 10. and that in this very chapter of *Ezekiel*, the glory of the God of *Israel* is said to be עליהם מלמעלה *over them* (viz. the *Cherubim*) *above*, ver 19. And it is said in both *Ezekiel's* visions, that the glory of God was *over their heads*, and consequently the *Cherubim* were *under* the glory. And so there is no need to have recourse to any other sense of תחת, than that which is commonly given in the versions, viz. υποκατω *sub, subter, &c.* Much less are there any grounds for asserting, as *the defender of Mr H.'s plan* doth, that the context *requires* us* to construe תחת a *substitute*.

THE

* P. 41. " The context not only bears but *requires*
 " us to construe תחת אלהי ישראל a *substitute* of the
 " *Aleim* of *Israel*, since the glory of *Jehovah*, or the glory
 " of the *Aleim* of *Israel* is *one* person, and the *Aleim* of
 " *Israel*, are *three* persons. The persons could not ap-
 " pear to fight, but by some representations. Here is no
 " other but the God-Man in glory (described to be a bright-
 " ness

108 DISCOURSE I.

THE reason he is pleased to give for asserting this is in effect no other, than that their construction of *Aleim* (not the context) requires it. For *Aleim* being expressive of the three persons in covenant, according to these Gentlemen, cannot properly be used of any *one* person in the Essence. I think so too, if their interpretation of *Aleim* be right. But then as it is really and undoubtedly used of the *second person only*, in Psal. xlv. ver. 6. "Thy throne, O God, (Heb. אֱלֹהִים) is for ever and ever," which St Paul thus applies, Heb. i. 8. "But to the Son he saith, "Thy throne, O God," &c. I presume to infer that it may also be used of the *second person only* in describing these visions: and further that for this reason (besides several others)

Mr

"ness like that of fire) above, and the *Cherubim* in a cloud, "fire, light below. What now stood for the *Aleim* of "of *Israel* but the *Cherubim*?" Again, p. 47. "The "glory of the Lord, and the *Cherubim*, are indeed two "distinct representations; and the context requires us to construe תחת a substitute of, and not under, since the glory "of the Lord is only *one* person; but the God or אֱלֹהִים "of *Israel* are three persons. That is, when the prophet "says the *Cherubim* were תחת the *Aleim* of *Israel*, he "cannot mean they were under the glory of *Jehovah*, for "the glory is not the *Aleim* of *Israel* though he is *one* "of those persons."

upon CHERUBIM. 109

Mr H.'s construction of *Aleim* will not hold *.

THERE will also arise a difficulty on this interpretation of תַּחַת by a *substitute*, which none of the writers on that side, as far as I have observed, have guarded against. Mr C. (Serm. p. 14.) says, "as
" man was not a party at making the cove-
" nant; so this figure, with the face of a
" man in it, could not be properly called
" *Elabim* or *Che-Elabim*. But as man by
" being united to a Peer of the Essence be-
" came a *Rub*, a great one, so they might
" all

* NOW consequently will that charge against the Jews appear just, at least so far as this word is concerned in it, which *the defender of the plan* lays upon them when he says — "The Apostate Jews have obtruded a parcel of rules upon us, by which they have obtruded such interpretations of their own on the sacred text, as makes it the silliest stuff ever wrote: and they have no regard to those which they own to be the general rules of the language: such as אֱלֹהִים being the plural termination masculine, any more than your friend has, who (page 21, &c.) several times construes אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל to be *one* person, though he must know that by rule אֱלֹהִים is plural, and so necessarily *two* or *more*." *Def.* p. 64. — But doth it necessarily mean two or more Psal. xlv. 6. whence it is applied in the New Test. to the Son only? Or ver. 7. *ibid.* "Wherefore God even *thy* God, אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים hath anointed thee, &c." where it relates to the *Father* only? Compare this with Acts iv. 27. and x. 38.

110 DISCOURSE I.

“all be called *Rubim*, and the similitudes
“*Cberubim*.”

BUT now if this figure with the face of a man in it (which Mr C. is pleased to stile *Cberubim* instead of *Cberub* *,) is called by the Prophet a *substitute* of the *Elabim*, why would it have been so improper for him to have called it *Cbe-Elabim*? For what is there to forbid the *one*, viz. the note of *similitude*, which does not hold equally strong for excluding the *other*, viz. the term of *substitution*? If Mr C.'s observation is right, it seems to follow, as a necessary consequence, that the Prophet's expression is not proper; for it should have been תחת רבים (instead of תחת אלהים) in order to have answered to the propriety of כרבים. But as there can be no error in the sacred Writer, I am most inclined to believe, that he neither meant a substitute by תחת, nor the figure with four visages by אלהים.

MR

* YET in other places, when this point of *Cbe-Elabim* was not in view, Mr C. is as explicit as possible (as in *his Answ. to Obj.* p. 69.), that each living creature, or *Cberub*, had but one body and four visages. “There was, I allow, a *Cberub* at every wheel, and so four *Cberubim* in “all.” *Ibid.*

upon CHERUBIM. 111

MR H.'s own account of this matter, is to the same effect with Mr C.'s. *Glor. and Grav.* p. 118.

"IF these three had only been exhibited," (says he, viz. the Bull, the Lyon, and the Eagle) "they, though types, might have been called *Aleim*. But as the man was taken in, and made one of them, they *could not* be called *Aleim*, the names, nor by any other word which is only used for the Persons in the Effence. Indeed, (says he) they are said to be *instead of the Aleim*."

IN which last words he seems to have been aware of the objection I have just now put. Yet instead of removing it, as one would have expected, he slips entirely over it, and says no more of the matter.

So again in his *Remarks*, p. 366. "The *Cherubim* are called *Aleim*, Ezek. i. 1. "And *instead of Aleim*, chap. x. 20." But how this consists with what he had said before in *Glor. and Grav.* p. 118. that they *could not be called Aleim*, for a reason there given; he leaves to his reader to find out. Who possibly will be able to make no more of it, than that Mr H.
hath

112 DISCOURSE I.

hath by his new and strained construction of these two expressions מראות אלהים and תחת אלהים, overthrown his own argument for the necessity of stiling them *Rubim* in the cherubic exhibition of them. For certainly if they are called *Aleim* by the Prophet, and are properly said by him to be substituted instead of the *Aleim*, there could be no impropriety in stiling them כאלהים, *sicut Aleim*.

II. THE next point to be taken into consideration, is that remarkable circumstance of the union of the man's visage with the lyon's in *Ezekiel's cherubim*, mentioned by Mr C. *Serm.* p. 13. *Answ. to Obf.* p. 68. by Mr H. *Remarks*, p. 373, &c. and by others.—By which their doctrine of the substitution of the *cherubic* form for the *Aleim* seems to be confirmed, and the incarnation of the second Person also to be notified and prefigured.

To which of the two descriptions given by *Ezekiel* (one in chap. i. and the other in chap. x.) Mr C. refers to, is not clear. By his placing the Bull first in order, he seems to have chap. x. 15. in his eye: And his printed reference is to the xth chapter. But by his joining the man and the

upon CHERUBIM. 113

the lyon together, he seems to have had immediate respect to chap. i. 10. Or possibly he judged the description, at least in regard to this important circumstance, to be the same in both places: Whereas Mr H. asserts, that they are different exhibitions; and that in the description given chap. x. *the man and the lyon's visages are not united* *. And therefore I may presume, that Mr C.'s reference to *Ezekiel*, should be understood of that description only, which is given in the first chapter.

WHERE I observe, in the first place, there is nothing said about *the number of heads* belonging to each *cherubic* form. It is only said, that the firmament was over *their heads*, viz. those of the four *Cherubim*; which determines nothing about the

I number

* *Remarks*, p. 373. "The faces in these figures are described chap. i. in a different order from those in chap. x. and both from that in the *Revelations*, as exhibitions of different scenes."

Ibid. p. 402. "In the first exhibition of this manifestation in *Ezekiel*, chap. i. The man as a Prophet, and the Lyon joined with him was placed foremost, then the Bull, then the Eagle. The next exhibition, chap. x. The Bull first, when he was to take vengeance on the man. Next after the Bull the man who was to act and suffer the part of the Priest. Next the Lyon, *so their faces are not exhibited united*: And lastly, the Eagle."

114 DISCOURSE I.

number of heads in each *Cherub*. Therefore I shall drop out of Mr C.'s account that expression, *So there were three heads*. For however this addition of *three* may help to confirm the notion of two faces belonging to *one* head, viz. the *Man's* and the *Lyon's*; yet as it is plainly unwarranted, it must not be admitted into proof.

THE defender of Mr H.'s plan speaks of four heads in this vision, p. 50. which is likewise without authority from the text.

MR H. in *Glor. and Grav.* p. 115. And *the Author of some Thoughts on Religion*, p. 108.—express themselves more warily by *four heads, OR visages*. By means of which disjunctive, the exhibition is capable of being understood, as Mr *Mede* explains it, viz. of *one head with four visages*.

AND, indeed, nothing appears from *Ezekiel*, but that the living creature which he describes had four *faces*, פנים. And even this is not expressed so very clearly, and distinctly, as not to admit of a different exposition from that which is expressed in our English version. And though nothing is to be built on the mere conjectures

jectures (as I apprehend them to be) of Villalpand, Grotius, and others, (*primi ordinis auctoribus*, says Spencer, a writer that espoused their constructions) who interpreted כַּרְיִיט in a more general sense, by *Phœces*, *formæ*, *appearances* *, and by that means found scope for a different explanation of the exhibition, from that which is firmed upon the idea of *four heads* in each *Cherub*, or of *one head* with four vi-
sages; I say, though these constructions of theirs are not to be depended upon, yet they are worth the perusal of any one who would take to his help all the lights and assistance he can meet with, for the better understanding these visions of *Ezekiel*.

I 2

I MUST

* “ *Univerſa fere quæ de Cherubinis ſuboriri poſſet difficultas ex vocis כַּרְיִיט notione pendere videtur. Quæ cum multiplex fit apud Hebræos ſi ad unam latinæ vocis facies aut vultus notionem contrahatur, in explicabiles pariet quæſtiones.*” *Villalp. Exp. in Ezek. Tom. II. p. 326.*

“ *Niſi vero voci כַּרְיִיט hoc in loco notionem paulo laxiorem aſſignemus, eamque non de vultu ſed formæ & exteriore ſpecie vel aſpectu corporis intelligemus, neceſſe erit ut parvulus aquilæ grandiori bovis, leonis, & hominis, vultui jungatur; adeoque cuius Cherubæ caput ultra poetarum ſigmenta monſtroſum & horridum tribuatur.*” — *Spencer de Orig. Arce & Cherubinorum*, p. 779.

116 DISCOURSE I.

I MUST observe in the next place, Mr C.'s ambiguous manner of expression, when he says, *The heads——of the man and the lyon together.* Which is true, supposing them to be distinct and separate, and only standing *together*, or placed *next to each other*, as were those of the Ox and the Eagle: But by which he must have meant that they were joined *together*, or united in such a peculiar manner, as to make one head with two visages, for he immediately adds, *So there were three heads and four visages.* But there is no authority from the text for any such peculiar junction or union, as he suggests. The passage, to which we must now have recourse, that I may give it in Mr H.'s own translation, as I find it in *Remarks*, p. 373, is as follows.

“As for the similitudes of their faces,
 “the faces of the man, and the faces of
 “the lyon upon the right to the four of
 “them; and the faces of the bull to the
 “left of the four of them, and the faces
 “of an eagle to the four of them.”

“Does not the *Vau* (says Mr H. *ibid.*)
 “join the faces of the man and the faces
 “of the lyon? The text (says Mr C. *Answ.*

“to

“ to *Obs.* p. 68.), remarkably couples them together with a *Vau*.”

IN answer to both, I observe, first, that the *Vau* may not be a *copulative* in this place, but the passage may be rendered truly from the Hebrew, as *Junius* and *Tremellius* have rendered it.

“ A c similitudo quidem faciei ipsorum faciei humanæ fuit ; S E D facies leonis ad dextram ipsis quatuor, & facies bovis a sinistra ipsis quatuor, itemque facies aquilæ ipsis quatuor erat.”

AND so *Job. Leusden.* Phil. Heb. Græc. p. 135.

AND secondly, supposing the *Vau* copulative in this place, as Mr *H.* doth, it will only set the man's face and the lyon's face on the same side, or place them together, but will not denote, or imply, in the natural and obvious construction, any such union of faces as is pretended, or their being joined together in any peculiar manner different from the *juxtaposition* of the other faces in the figure. For each face hath it's *Vau* to join it with the rest, as well as the lion to join it with the man. And therefore the interpreters who look upon the *Vau* as copulative, speak of the

118 DISCOURSE I.

position of the man's face and the lyon's on one side, as upon the same footing with the face of the ox, and the eagle on the other *.

NAY, lastly, if such a peculiar junction of the man's and lyon's faces, as is asserted, could be reasonably inferred from the copulative *Vau*, yet would it not follow that it denoted the union of the manhood with a person of the Divine Nature, any more than the hands of a man to each of the living creatures, should denote the same union with each of the Divine Persons. *Ezek. i. 8.* "They had the hands of a man under their wings, on their four sides."

THE author of *Some Thoughts conc. Religion*, has carried Mr *H.*'s point as far as it will go, and prudently no further. He observes—"That the faces of the man and the lyon are said to have been on the

* *Castalio* renders the text. "Erant autem eorum facies eâ figura ut illa quatuor haberent dexterâ parte *humanam leoninamque* faciem, sinistrâ *bovinam & aquilinam.*"—And in this he is followed by *Clarius*, and others.

Calvin in a note upon the text,—"Dicit igitur ad dextram fuisse quasi faciem *hominis & leonis*, ad sinistram vero faciem *bovis & aquilæ.*"—*Calv.* ad locum.

upon CHERUBIM. 119

“ the right side, whereas the face of the
 “ bull is said to have been on the left side ;
 “ and fourthly, the face of an eagle,
 “ *without taking notice of any particular*
 “ *conjunction* between the face of the bull
 “ and that of the eagle.” p. 108.

TRUE: therefore we must not suppose the faces of the bull and eagle to have been joined. And for the same reason, *viz.* because the prophet doth not *take notice of any particular conjunction*, between the face of the man and the face of the lion, saving that they were both on the same side ; therefore we must not suppose any further conjunction of them, than that they both stood together on the right side, as the faces of the ox and eagle did on the left.

AND I think this is the idea which Mr H. himself gives of the position of the faces in the *Cherubim* on the ark of the covenant, *viz.* that the man's and the lion's faces were placed on the one side, just as the faces of the ox and the eagle were placed on the other. See *Glor. and Grav.* p. 115*.

I 4

BUT

* His words are,

“ THE figure at the one end,” (*viz.* of the mercy seat)
 “ had two of the four faces, suppose those of the *lion*
 “ and

120 DISCOURSE I.

“BUT were not the two faces” says Mr *H. Remarks*, p. 373.) “of the man and the lyon always *together*, without the “other two in *Ezekiel's* temple.”

YES, they were *together*, and without the other two. But they looked opposite ways or obliquely different ways, the angel which was between them standing outwards; the man's face was towards the “palm tree on the one side, and the face “of the young lyon was towards the “palm tree on the other side, and it was “made through all the house round “about.” *Ezek. xli. 19.* * But it doth not follow from hence that these two faces were otherwise joined, than in that man-in which the *Ox* and the *Man* are joined in the vision under consideration, viz. the the *man's* face was on the right side, and the face of the *ox* on the left side. And it appears

“and the *man* inward; and the other figure had the other “two faces, the *ox* and the *eagle* inward. So that two beheld two, and all four the mercy seat. And the two other “faces in the first figure, the *ox* and the *eagle*, must look “outward; and in the second figure, the *lyon* and the *man*, “must look *outward*. So all four look outward to the walls “of the house, emblematically behold all other things.”

* How this text is accounted for by those who interpret פנים in the more general sense of *parts*, may be seen in *Villalpand. 2. Tom. p. 324.* I am only enquiring here into the consistency of Mr *H.'s* accounts.

upon CHERUBIM. 121

appears also by Mr H.'s own account of the next vision in Ch. X. (where he owns that the man's face and the lyon's face *were not exhibited united*, *Remarks*, p. 402.) that they may be said to be together, or to stand next to each other, without being united or joined in any other sense of junction, than what is common to the other faces in the same exhibition.

IN what has been now said on this point, there will be found a ready solution of those difficulties and inconsistencies, that the *defender of the plan* imagines he discovers, in what was observed by the *modest apologist* on the same subject.

The *defender* has advanced nothing in evidence of this peculiar junction, but what Mr H. and Mr C. had said before him. And the supposed difficulties and inconsistencies in the apologist's account, appear to be mere mistakes of the *defender* himself, from not sufficiently attending to the other's meaning. The *Mod. Apol.* explains an expression in the vision, Ch. I. from whence this union of the man's face with the lyon's is pretended to be inferred by the second vision Ch. X. where the faces are expressly separated. But the
defender

122 DISCOURSE I.

defender of the plan still abiding by his own interpretation of the expression in the first vision, whence the junction is inferred, makes his own account of the position of the faces clash with that of the apologist, taken from the other vision, and then is pleased to father the contradiction and absurdity on the apologist.

I HAVE been the more particular in examining this article, upon account of its consequence in Mr *H.*'s main Hypothesis, concerning the *Cberubim*. The proof of this circumstance of the union of the two faces ought to have been very plain, before it could be presumed that there was any intention of prefiguring in this exhibition, the redemption of human nature by one of the Divine Persons taking flesh, and becoming man for that purpose. And the failure of a *plain proof* of this material circumstance, leaves room for strong suspicions that the *Cberubim* was not, *as explained to be, an Hieroglyphic or sacred image, to describe as far as figures could go, the Aleim, and man taken into their Essence.* (*Pref. to Mr H.'s Works New Edit.*) For however plausible the conjecture might have seemed in this particular, if there had

had been any good evidence of the man's peculiar union with the lyon; yet his being placed in the Hieroglyphic as a distinct animal, and being by his natural prerogative the principal or chief animal in the compound, is a presumption that all the the four figures, thus put together in vision, were emblematical of something more adequately represented by them, than *the persons in Jehovah* can be supposed to be.

MR H. indeed, who was seldom at a loss for a *salvo* to apparent difficulties attending his expositions, has told us, that "the number of potentates in the Essence, was not determined by the number of figures, but by the creatures in each, *besides the man.*" That is, if I take it right, it is not the number but the species of the animals in each figure or *Cherub*, (man excepted) from whence it is collected, that they are emblems of *Rubbin*. And this is what I apprehend is intimated also by Mr Romaine, *Nom. Prop. Int. sub voce Cherubim*, where he says, "Propheta unum tantum fuisse corpus asserit cui quatuor sunt impositæ facies, *Tauri, Aquilæ, Leonis, et Hominis.* Semper hi

124 DISCOURSE I.

“ hi habiti sunt omnium animalium principes. Sententia *Talmud* de hac re est notatu digna. Quatuor sunt in mundo “ superbi (i. e. excellentes) Leo inter “ feras, Bos inter jumenta, Aquila inter “ volucres, Homo super omnia.”

THIS passage in the *Talmud* goes one step further, viz. *At Deus eminet super universa*. Which when added to the sentence is unfavourable to the application of it to Mr R.'s construction of the Cherubic Form. For although this passage was not improperly quoted and applied to the *Cherubim* by *Spencer* *, who looked upon these animal forms from their respective dignities in the animal creation, to be suitable ornaments of the throne on which God was represented as sitting in majesty; yet when it is introduced in support of a notion, that the *three brute animal* forms were emblems of the *three Divine Persons*, it seems to lose its propriety of accommodation. In *Spencer's* view, the several heads

or

* “ Animalia illa principatum quendam tenebant inter “ varios animantium ordines; eorum itaque formæ solii “ divini dignitati maxime conveniebant. Huc spectat effatum illud Talmudicorum “ ארבעה גיותנן בעולם וכו' ”

Dissert. de Orig. Arcæ et Cherub. p. 775.

Vide *Schindleri Lexic. Pent. Col. 267.*

or chiefs of the three superior classes of the brute creation, are considered as holding their proper rank in the scale of Beings in due subordination to man; and serving and ministring, *with man*, to the will of him, *qui eminet super universa*. But in Mr R.'s view of these symbols in conjunction, the order of nature, as well as symbolical propriety, seems to be inverted. The brute beasts which God hath put under man's feet, are dignified by being hieroglyphical representations of his mysterious Being; while man, who alone may boast *his image* on earth, and who is their *natural Lord and Master*, (*Homo super omnia*) stands *unsymbolically* for his own *species*: and *naturally* represents an object infinitely inferior to what the beasts are *emblems of*, by that very form which distinguishes his claim to dominion over them.

MR C. seems to guard against this objection by saying, that the "Figures of men were not proper for giving a resemblance of the Divine Three, for such an emblematical exhibition had not distinguished the man from the other three." *Serm. p. 13.*

BUT

126 DISCOURSE I.

BUT it cannot be said there was no way of distinguishing the human nature from the Divine, by some suitable emblem; which would have been as easily explained by revelation and tradition, as the other animal representatives of Divine Persons were. A despicable reptile at the feet of the beasts, would better have suited the emblematical nature of the vision (if it had been designed to denote the Trinity and Man), and would have made it more of a piece, than the representation of man in his own form and nature in conjunction with beasts, that did not represent their own natures. A blind earthworm would have been altogether as significant an emblem of the human *species* as the *Rubbin* (so Mr H. calls them) of the brute creation were of the Trinity: And the analogy between the parts of the hieroglyphic had been much more conspicuous.

IF it should be said that the design of the *Cberubim* in *this particular*, was to exhibit the humanity of Christ only, or that One immaculate Son of Man, who was to suffer for the whole race, and to become (as Mr C. says) a *Rub* by his future union with

with a Peer of the Essence: It should also be remembered, that the known emblem of that unspotted and passible Nature of Christ throughout the Scriptures is the Lamb; which is said to be *slain from the foundation of the world*, Rev. xiii. 8. Which is the principal *Type* of him throughout the Old Testament, and an *appellation* given to him in the New, when he appeared in the flesh; *Behold the Lamb of God*, John i. 29. And which was his chief representative in the visions of St *John* in the Apocalyps. And had the *Lyon* and the Lamb been joined together in *Ezekiel's* visions, they would seem to have been better accommodated to the rest of the exhibition, in Mr *H.*'s construction of it, than the *Lyon* and the *Man*.

BUT, after all, how do we know that Christ's humanity was designed to be prefigured by a man's visage in the Cherubim? The two texts produced by Mr *H.* to this purpose in *Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 141. whether as arguments, or only as illustrations, I know not, will in neither view have any weight or effect.

HIS

128 DISCOURSE I.

HIS words are,

“THIS vision exhibited mercy to man.
 “The wrath was to fall upon his surety.
 “*Pfal. lxxx. 17.* Let thy hand be upon
 “איש *the man of thy right hand, his posi-*
 “*tion in the Cherubim,* upon the Son of
 “Man, whom thou madest strong for
 “thyself.”

Pfal. cx. 1.——“Jehovah said to אדני
 “my lord, sit at my *right-hand* till I make
 “thine enemies thy foot-stool.”

BUT neither of these illustrations, if I
 may call them so, can be allowed upon
 Mr *H.*'s own principles; not to mention
 the other very obvious exceptions against
 them.

FOR the *lxxxth Psalm* is a prayer directed, not to the person represented by the bull, but to יושב הכרובים, ver. 1. to אלהים, ver. 3. and 4. in respect of whom the man's position in the *Cherubim* was no more to the right than to the left.

NEITHER can *Pfal. cx. 1.* relate to the human form in the said position; for though אדון is confessedly meant of Christ, to be exalted to God's right-hand, as the passage predicts, yet when the time came for the completing this prediction, the
 man's

man's position in the Cherubim was changed: He is represented as suffering, (*Remarks*, p. 402.) and in a state of separation from the lyon; the ox, the wrath, is interposed between them. (*Def. of the Plan*, p. 45.) And it is *the Lamb*, not the *Man* in the *Cherubim*, that gains the *Throne*, and is invested with the *Emblems of Divinity for having been slain*. *Def. of the Plan*. p. 43. and *Remarks*, p. 403.

IN short it seems to me, if I may presume to utter so bold a thing, that this whole exposition of the human form in the Cherubim stands upon this single bottom, viz. that Mr *H.* could not adjust the compound figure to his favourite opinion of its being an hieroglyphic of the Trinity, without giving this solution to the appearance of a *man* in the composition. Whereas *supposing* the *three other animals* to be the legitimate and appropriated emblems, as he conceived, of the *three Divine Persons*, he presumed the human face superadded to them, might properly denote the Incarnation; or *Man*, as he expresses it, *taken into the Trinity*. (*Int. to Moses sine Princ.* p. 281.)

130 DISCOURSE I.

IN saying, indeed, that he only *supposed* the three other animals to be emblematick of the Persons in Jehovah, I seem to pay no great regard to his repeated and positive assertions, that *the Bull* represented the *Father*, that the *Lion* was the constant emblem of the *second Person*, and that the *Eagle* denoted the Holy Spirit. And as a good deal of pains hath been taken to make this out, (and, indeed, with good reason, for unless it be well made out, his whole Hypothesis concerning the meaning of this Hieroglyphic, will be destitute of its necessary confirmation) it is proper I should subjoin my reasons why I cannot admit the proofs that have hitherto been brought, in support of this material point, to be sufficient for that purpose.

S E C T.

S E C T. VI.

Mr H.'s Hypothesis not supported by any proofs of Ezekiel's three brute animals being emblems of the Divine Persons.

WHERE is it in Scripture that these three animals, the *Bull*, *Lion*, and *Eagle* are mentioned or referred to as the appointed emblems of the Divine Persons? Or, upon what authority from any inspired writer are we to conclude, that these *Rubbim* of the several species of brutes are the pictures or images, by interpretation, of the *Potentates* in the *Essence*?

WHY, Mr H. has pointed out to us the several passages from whence he supposes this may be collected.

WITH regard to the *Bull* for instance, as an *emblem* of the *Father*, he enters into the following method of proof.

132 DISCOURSE I.

HE enquires what was meant by the molten *calf* at *Sinai*, and the *calves* or *beifers* set up by *Jeroboam* at *Bethel*: and whether they represented the *true God* or the *Airs*.—He observes, that the *Bull* stood for the *Heavens* among the *Egyptians*, and was the representative of one of the Heathen *Rubbin*. But he observes further, that it stood for *Jehovah* at Mount *Sinai*; and that *Jehovah* was the object of worship to some of the *Israelites* who bowed the knee to the *Calves*; though others of the *Israelites* worshipped *Baal* through the *Calves*.—That the worship of *Baal* under this figure, was rank idolatry—but that it may be doubted whether the Worship of *Jehovah* under this figure was idolatry or not, &c. See his *Essay towards a natural History of the Bible*. p. 100, &c. from whence I have collected these particulars.

HE tells us in *Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 184. that before the orders, which were given in the Mount about the *Cherubim*, were communicated to the people: “They set
“up the figure of a *Bull* and worshipped
“*Jehovah* before it: So renounced *Christ*
“the *Glory*. Afterwards this figure” (viz.
the

upon CHERUBIM. 133

the *Cherubim*) “ was set up and kept them
“ right, till *Jeroboam* who had been in
“ *Egypt*, set up the *Bull* again in the ten
“ Tribes; for this the Jews were carried
“ into captivity, This made them deny
“ and crucify Christ.”

Now what he would infer from hence,
if I take his meaning right, is this, that
the sin of setting up the *Calf* at *Sinai*,
and the *Heifers* at *Bethel*, lay, in respect
of the worshippers of *Jehovah*, in repre-
senting, and in worshipping under that re-
presentation *One Person* only, exclusive of
the other two Persons in the Deity. And
that although they worshipped the *Father*
under his proper emblem *the Bull*, yet by
worshipping him *alone*, they renounced
their Saviour Christ. And consequently,
the Bull was the appropriated emblem of
the *first Person*.

BUT the matter does not stand in this
light in the holy Scriptures. For in all the
places where the worship of the *Calf* is
spoken of it is condemned as idolatry, be-
cause the *Calf* was an *Idol* *; though

K 3

Jehovah

* So St Stephen, Acts vii. 4. They made a *calf* in
those days, and offered sacrifice unto the *idol*, τῷ εἰδωλῷ.

134 DISCOURSE I.

Jehovah might be, as he says, and most probably was, the object of worship through that image *. Whence it appears, that the worship even of the true God by an image or material representation is idolatry. And it was for the punishment of *this idolatry* that the *Israelites*, as we learn, *Acts* vii. 42. were delivered up to the worship of the Host of Heaven instead of God.

AND Mr *H.*'s suggestions of their crime consisting principally in directing their worship to the Father only, are by no means consonant with Scripture. For after the fullest revelation of the three Persons in the Trinity, worship directed or addressed to the Father by name, is not only allowed of, but commanded †: though

* *Psal.* cvi. 20. They changed their Glory into the similitude of an Ox that eateth grass.—*Quod Deum omni sufficientem bovi æquiparent.*

† “The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at *Jerusalem*, worship *the Father*.—“True worshippers shall worship *the Father* in Spirit and “in Truth, for the *Father* seeketh such to worship him.” *John* iv. 21, 23.

Mr *H.* indeed, will not allow the *first Person* to be meant in these texts, nor even in *Matth.* vi. 9. and *Luke* xi. 2. “Our Father which art in Heaven,” &c. And whose-

though at the same time under this revelation All Worship is ultimately paid to each of the Divine Persons. And therefore, before this explicit revelation was made, worshipping the father alone can scarce be thought to have been that heinous sin, which he supposes the *Israelites* guilty of in worshipping the *Calf*.

NEITHER is this supposition consistent with Mr *H.*'s construction of *Aleim*. For we find the peoples request to *Aaron* was, "make us אלהים to go before us" *Exod.* xxxii. 1. And they said, when the calf was made ver. 4. "These be אלהיך thy Gods, O Israel." Either therefore the molten *Calf* was not looked upon by them as an emblem of one Divine Person, exclusive of the others, or if it was, they understood אלהים, in a different sense

whosoever peruses what he says on this head in *Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 267. and *Data*, Vol. II. p. 148. will be apt to wonder why he was so solicitous to set aside the obvious meaning of these texts relating to the worship of the *Father* alone, till he recollects that these texts in their common interpretation, stood strongly in the way of his argument to prove the bull an emblem of the *Father*. For as he had but one Scripture-Argument to alledge for that proof, it became necessary that he should support it at all events.

136 DISCOURSE I.

sense from that in which Mr *H.* expounds it.

AND here I may conclude this article, for I have not found in any part of his writings, that he hath any other proof to produce *from Scripture*, of a *Bull* being the representative of ~~or~~ God the Father, than what arises from his own assumptions, upon the idolatrous adoration of the *Calf* at *Sinai*, and the renewal of it at *Bethel* under *Jeroboam*; which, to my thinking, are very little to the purpose. What he alledges from the Heathens shall be considered hereafter.

As to the *lyon*, said to be appropriated to the *second Person*, there is indeed some better countenance for it from an expression in the *Rev.* v. 5. where Christ incarnate of the house of David, is called the *Lyon of Judah, the root of David*: (*Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 266. and *Remarks*, 398.) as known by these two titles, the one taken, as is commonly thought from *Gen.* xlix. 9. * and the other from *Isaiab* xi. 1, 10. †.

Now

* " *Judah is a lyon's whelp. From the prey, my son, thou art gone up. He couched as a lyon, who shall rouse him up.* "

† Ver. 1. " And there shall come forth a rod out of
" the

upon CHERUBIM. 137

Now had Mr H. been content to say with St Chrysostom, that the type of a lyon did constantly, in Scripture, denote *might and strength, regal power and the dominion of a King* *, and that when it was occasionally applied to Christ, it denoted Βασιλικον Αξίωμα, as Eusebius says, † it might have been well defended from several instances of such metaphorical usage of it ‡. But to speak of it as an emblem

“ the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.”

Ver. 10. “ And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign to the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek.”

By comparing these two last verses together, we may account for the title given to Christ, Rev. xxii. 16. viz. “ I am the root and the offspring of David. Η ρίζα, και το γένος, the former word answering to יְשׁוּעָה the root of Jesse, ver. 10. above; and the other to נֶצֶחַ מְשֻׁרְשִׁי a branch out of his roots, ver. 1. expressed otherwise by צֶמַח germen. LXX Αναβολη. And some have thought this title occurs with that of the lyon in Gen. xlix. 9. as they do in the above-cited passage in the Apocalypse. For the LXX have it Σκυμνὸν λεοντος Ισδα εκ Βλαστῶν με μὲν ἀνέβη.

* Chrysostom Hom. 67. in Gen. xlix. 9. Σκυμνὸν λεοντος Ισδα—την βασιλειαν αὐτῶν περιεγει. Εὐθὺς γὰρ αὖτις τῇ Γραφῇ διὰ τῆς εἰκόνος τέτυκται ὡς τὴν βασιλικὴν Αὐθενσίαν αἰνιτίζεται.

† Dem. Evang. Lib. VIII. p. 232.

‡ Thus Targ. renders מְשֻׁרְשִׁי, *lyons*, Ezek. xix 2. by מלכֵי Kings. And כַּפְרִיִּם Young lions, *ibid.* by שְׁלֹשֹׁנֵי Princes.

138 DISCOURSE I.

emblem peculiar to the second Person, and appropriated, as it were, to Christ, as Mr *H.* doth, or as the *constant emblem* of the second Person, as Mr *C.* speaks (Serm. p. 13.) is to talk without authority from Scripture, where there are no instances, or intimations of such appropriation (unless *Cherubim* under Mr *H.*'s exposition of it may be thought one) and where the lion, though it be once or twice applied to Christ, is not made his distinguishing emblem, borrowed from the class of animals, as the *Lamb* is; but is frequently used

Princes. And the like interpretations will be found in *Targ.* on *Jeremiah* ii. 15. and iv. 7. and *Nahum* ii. 12, &c.

AND it is observable, that the metaphor of the *branch*, in its application to Christ, is thought to denote dominion, as well as the metaphor of the lion. (Sceptres being anciently made of rods or small branches of trees. *Ezek.* xix. 11, 12, 14.) And therefore instead of a *rod* out of the *stem of Jesse*, *Isa.* xi. 1. *Targ.* hath it *Rex de filiis Jesse*. And ver. 10. is rendered by the LXX Η γένεα τῆς Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνίσταμενος αὐτῶν ἐθνῶν. And *Arab.* qui surrecturus est ad dominandum in gentes.

AND it is further observable, that in the last Chap. of *Rev.* ver. 16. The root and off-spring of *David* is coupled with another of Christ's titles, viz. the *bright and morning star*, instead of the *lion of Judah*, as in Chap. V. But still to the same effect: for a star in the symbolical language imports *regal power and dominion*, as well as the lion doth. See Mr *Daubuz's* learned Commentary on the *Apocalypse*.

used to express characters very different from his.

SHOULD it be said that the visions however ought to be interpreted by each other, and the lion in *Ezekiel's* visions must be understood to be an emblem of the same person who is characterized by the *Lion* of Judah in the visions of *St John*; I answer, that neither is this a good rule of interpretation; for it will hold, if admitted, in *Daniel's* visions, as well as in *Ezekiel's*. And then *the Lion with wings* in *Daniel's* vision of the four beasts, Ch. VII. 4. must be interpreted of the *second Person* too, which I believe neither *Mr H.* nor *Mr C.* would by any means have allowed.

MR H. speaking of the position of the animals in the *Cherubim*, *Remarks*, p. 397. quotes this text from *Ezek.* Chap. xliii. ver. 15.

“AND from *the lion of God* and upward shall be four horns.”

HE infers nothing from hence himself, but leaves his reader to make the obvious application, that the *lion of God* must mean here what the emblem always imports, or at least must have some very close and peculiar

140 DISCOURSE I.

peculiar relation to him, as being more than ordinarily expressive of his nature and dignity.

THE word in *Ezekiel* xliii. 15. is **ההראל** in the first place; but in the end of the verse, and in the verse following **האראל**, which cannot regularly signify *the Lyon of God*. The *Keri* directs it to be read **האריאל** in the two last places, but on what grounds appears not. The *Syriac* hath **הראיל** in all three places. And which of these four is the right word cannot now perhaps be ascertained, much less what the etymology of it is. Our translators, indeed, have thought fit to put into the margin of our Bibles, over against the word *Altar*, (to which signification the context evidently confines it) at verse 15, in the first place——“*Harel*, that is, “*Mountain of God*.”——And in the next place——“*Ariel*, that is, *Lyon of God*.” * But how can it be collected with Mr *H.* from hence, that the lion is emblematical of the second Person? For if *the Altar*,
by

* This word *Ariel* occurs without the ה in the xxixth of *Ijaiab*, no less than five times, as a name given to the city of *Jerusalem*. Some say, from the altar being placed therein.

upon CHERUBIM. 141

by being called *the Lyon of God*, (supposing that to be the meaning of the Hebrew word) be really any proof of this, we may with equal reason conclude from the *same Altar* being also called *Harel*, or the *Mountain of God*, in the same verse, that a *mountain* is an emblem, or some ways emblematical of the second Person too. For what is there in the text to induce one to believe the former, which will not equally incline one to give credit to the latter? Unless more credit may be given to what Mr *H.* quotes from the *Rabbins. Glor. and Grav.* p. 132. in these words.

“THE Rabbies tell us, very positively
“cited by *Buxtorf*, in his *Arca Fæderis*,
“That during the first Temple, the figure
“of a Lyon couchant, always appeared
“in the fire of the sacrifice: indeed he
“was typified there, and if those who
“have told this story had known what
“it meant, we should not have had
“it.”

BUT this tradition is delivered only by those, *qui nugacissimi plurima deliramenta commentari solent* (as Mr *Romaine* says of them). And it doth not appear whether
Mr

142 DISCOURSE. I.

Mr *H.* himself gave any credit to it or not.

ANOTHER of his arguments, in proof of this emblem, is drawn from the usage of the word כפר, which he observes, (*Glor. and Grav.* p. 131.) signifies a *young lion*, and is also a term used for the cover of the Ark, or Mercy-Seat, stiled in Greek ιλασθριον, and in Latin *propitiatorium*. (כפר the Propitiatory-Seat, the Coverer, Expiator, a young Lion, *ibid.* p. 41.) Which word St *Paul* uses speaking of Christ, "Ου προσεδετο ο Θεος ιλασθριον. Quem Deus proposuit *Propitiatorium*, Rom. iii. 25. " Whence *Pagnin*, 1212. כפר——A type " of Christ, as St *Paul* teaches, Rom. iii. " As the law, by which is the knowledge " of sin, was covered by the lid of the " Ark, so Christ covers, &c." (*Glor. and Grav.* p. 132.) Put all this together, and כפר which is a *lion*, is a *type*, that is to say, an *emblem* of Christ.

BUT there are two reasons why no stress should be laid on these inductions. The first is that כפר, as Mr *H.* writes it, (*Glor. and Grav.* p. 131.) is not the word used for a young *lion*, but כפיר, and so it is wrote in all places when *singular*, though there

upon CHERUBIM. 143

there be three or four instances in the plural, where the *Jod* is omitted. And כפר as he again writes it, (*ibid.* p. 132.) is not the word used by *Pagnin*, but כפרת, and this latter, not the former, is the *ελαττησιον*, to which *St Paul* alludes. And therefore כפר, כפיר and כפרת, are three different nouns, of divers significations, and are ranged as such in *Conr. Kircher's* Concordance, though all of them are allowed to come from the same root.

THE other reason is, that כפיר with the *Jod* is so far from being used as an emblem of Christ, that it is sometimes applied to characters quite opposite to his. It is made the emblem of a *tyrant*, or *devourer of men*, Ezek. xix. 3. It is that *young lyon* which Christ was to tread under his feet, and which is coupled with the *dragon* in *Psal.* xci. 13. From whence it appears that כפיר *leunculus*, hath as little relation to Christ, as *an emblem*, as it hath to כפרת *Arcae operculum*, as a noun.

AND lastly, as for what is cited out of *Rev.* chap. x. 3. Of a *mighty Angel*, "that cried with a loud voice, as when a *lyon* roareth;" it may in the first place be justly questioned, whether Christ be here meant

144 DISCOURSE I.

meant or not. The Commentators, I think, generally suppose that he is not meant. And in the next place, supposing he is to be understood by the *mighty Angel*, yet this expression *ωπερ λεων μυκαλει*, amounts to no more than a *simile*, or a comparison, which is occasionally made use of both in the Old and New Testament, upon very different subjects, and used even of the Devil himself, who is said “to walk about *as a roaring lion*, “seeking whom he may devour.” 1 Pet. v. 8. From this expression therefore, nobody would choose to attempt any proof, or illustration of the emblematical import of the *lion*, in respect of Christ.

THEN as for the *eagle*, or third figure in the *Cherubim*, Mr H. gives no Scripture proof that I can find of it's being an emblem of, or of it's application to, the Holy Spirit.

HAD the *dove* been exhibited instead of it, it would have been more easily applicable to the *third Person*, because he is represented by the appearance of that innocent and amiable bird in the New Testament.

MR

MR H. indeed, shews at large that the eagle was sacred among the Heathen. (*Heb. Writings Perfect*, p. 401.) And truly there are few animals that were not so among some or other of the Gentile idolaters.

KINGS, indeed, are compared to eagles in Scripture, as well as to lyons, (See the Parable concerning *Nebuchadnezzar* and *Pharaoh*, in *Ezek. xvii.*) and very probably because those animals are the kings or chiefs of their respective kind.

THE tender care of *Jehovah* over the *Israelites* in the desert, is figured likewise in *Deut. xxxii.* by an eagle fluttering over her young, &c. (see ver. 11.) As it was impossible this passage should escape Mr H. so he quotes it indeed, but in such a manner, as pretty plainly shews he knew not how to apply it, to the Holy Spirit, and therefore he drops that application. The place I here refer to is *Heb. Writ. Perf.* p. 403, 404 *.

L

AND

* The eagle, as *Pierius* writes of it, in the sacred Writings, signifies the Presence as it were, or Efflux of the Divine Being, by which we are raised to a greater and more superior knowledge of Divine Matters, as the *Cabalists* say; whence *Moses*, "As the eagle inviting her young to
" fly,

146 DISCOURSE I.

AND now to speak at once to all Mr *H.*'s collateral proofs taken from the Heathen hieroglyphics, viz. that the three animals abovementioned, represented in their idolatrous worship, the *great Ones*, their *Rubbim*—that the *Bull* was their emblem of *Fire*, the *Lyon* of *Light*, the *Eagle* of *Wind* or *Spirit*,—that it is not to be supposed that the Heathens could otherwise have come to the knowledge of these material *Rubbim*, or *sicut Rubbim*, but from tradition of the Scripture Philosophy—or, that they would ever have been induced to worship these delegated agents, under the figures of men and beasts, especially under such compound figures of animals, as were frequent among them, if there had not been an exemplar of that kind in the *Cherubim*; an original emblem of the true *Rubbim*, which they mistook and misapplied

“ fly, and fluttering over them, expands her wings: So
“ *he took him, and carried him upon his shoulders.*”
Deut. xxxii.

The latter clause of which, is in the original, יהוה בדר
ינחנו The Lord alone did lead him.

And so far as *Pierius*'s authority will go in the case, there is in his sixth book *de Aquilâ*, chap. xxi. a long parallel of resemblance drawn between the *eagle* in the *Cherubim*, and *St John* the *Evangelist*, which may stand against Mr *H.*'s quotations from him on this head.

applied—I say, as to all this kind of reasoning, (in which, if one were to pursue him closely, as many volumes might be wrote as his Works consist of) I shall only give two general answers.

I. THE first is, that however the Heathen Mythology, Philosophy, and Worship may receive (or hath received from learned and discreet hands) illustration from Scripture; and however the Scripture may receive, or hath received, confirmation or illustration in some points particularly, as in Chronology, Chorography, and historical facts, from profane writings; yet the Scripture is not to be expounded in any points of consequence to faith and practice merely by Heathen customs, or fabulous traditions.

MR H. often warns us never to take any thing upon trust from the *Jews*, especially the *Rabbies*; for what they say is, in his account, of no authority in any material point in which Christianity is concerned. (Query, Whether he was always governed by this rule himself?) Yet there is scarce a remnant of profane Writings, but if it will any ways countenance his peculiar expositions, even in the most im-

148 DISCOURSE I.

portant articles, it is brought in *as evidence*. But others, perhaps, may esteem this *bea-then evidence* on some subjects, as little, as he pretended to esteem the *Rabbinical*; and will not scruple to say, that if there be no proof from Scripture that the *Bull*, *Lyon*, and *Eagle*, are the *stated emblems* of the *Trinity*, we have no reason to trust to any proof of this which is brought from mistaken notions of unbelievers; who lay in darkness and ignorance of the true God, and who worshipped idols in an infinite variety, according to their own imaginations; and whose accounts of their religious symbols are as irreconcilable with each other as their worship was, and as inexplicable as their follies.

EVEN after all the pains Mr *H.* has taken to prove that the *Bull* was their emblem of *Fire* at the orb of the sun, yet other authors have shewn that their chief representative of *this* was *the Ram*. And Mr *Holloway* himself scruples not to own, that "*the Ram in their hieroglyphics was the Sun's capital image.*" *Orig. Vol. II. p. 217.* So again, speaking of *Hbamanim*, or the *Sun images*, he says, he "*supposes they were no other than their Hammon in*
" *form*

upon CHERUBIM. 149

“form of a Ram, with some other zodiacal
“additions.” *Ibid.* p. 216. Eusebius also
mentions an idol dedicated to the Sun,
κεφαλὴν κριὸς κεκλήμενον καὶ βασιλείου κεφαλὰ τραυῶν
εἶχον, viz. having a Ram’s head with Goat’s
horns.

’Tis true, we are told, that the Egyp-
tians did also worship *the Sun* under the
form of a *Bull*, as well as under the form
of a *Ram*: and from hence Mr *H.* has
deduced his suppositions about the molten
Calf being an emblem of the *Fire*, or first
Person in the Trinity. But it is also to
be remembered, that they worshipped *the*
Moon too under the same emblem: for
the *Bull* at *Memphis* represented the one,
and the *Bull*——*Mnevis* at *Heliopolis*, re-
presented the other *. So little depen-

L 3

dance

* “Saltem Sacerdotes & sapientissimus quisque genti-
“lium *Bovem Heliopolitanum* non habuere nisi pro symbolo
“*Dei Solis*, & *Memphiticum* pro symbolo *Lunæ*.” *Vossius*
de Idol. Vol. I. p. 561.

“Cum *Heliopolitani* suum sc. *Bovem* dicassent *Soli*,
“*Memphitæ* suum sacrarunt *Lunæ*. Quod traditum *Æli-*
“*ano*. Lib. xi. *Hist. Animal.* cap. 11.” *Ibid.* p. 112.
Where *Vossius* shews at large from *Julius Maternus*, and
others, that *Apis* (or the Bull of *Memphis*) was an emblem
of *Joseph* the Patriarch, and treats the Ox as aptissimum
symbolum *Frumenti* five *Annonæ*.

150 DISCOURSE I.

dance is to be had upon the accounts of their hieroglyphics.

AND as for the *Lyon*, as an emblem of the Light, whosoever reads the first book of *Pierius's* Egyptian Hieroglyphics may observe, that in an enumeration of about forty things, of which the *Lyon* was made a symbol or emblem; Light is not so much as mentioned to be one of them.

AND the like may be observed in his nineteenth book concerning the *Eagle*, where, among thirty things to which that animal hath been symbolically applied, no mention is made of *Wind* or *Spirit*.

AND were one solicitous to confront Mr *H.*'s collections of authorities, for the application of his three emblems to his three material Agents, with a variety of proofs of their being emblems also of many other things. Three or four books, such as *Laurentius Pignorius's* *Mens. Ifiac. Gerb.* *Jo. Vossius de Theol. Gentili*, and *Athanasius Kircher's* *Oedipus Ægyptiacus*, would furnish one with a large treasure of materials. But I can see no reason to be anxious about the event of Mr *H.*'s manner of arguing from this topic, or to reply particularly to what he infers from his
heathen

heathen collections : and so shall proceed to my *other general Answer*, which is this.

2. THAT his whole doctrine concerning the Gentile worship of these animal forms, taking it's origin from the misapplication of the emblems in the *Cherubim*, seems to be a mere supposition of his own. They might use the forms of the animals abovementioned in the worship of their deities, without borrowing those forms from Revelation. Or they might worship images of those animals as deities, without being induced thereto by a corrupted tradition of such kind of figures being exhibited at Paradise. For when men had depraved themselves, and had departed from the knowledge of the true God, there are no absurdities so great, but they may be supposed to have taken up with ; neither is it any wonder they should proceed, by a just judgment, from one infatuation to another. And this, I conceive, is the light in which the Holy Scriptures represent their wickedness and follies.

BUT Mr *H.* seems at a loss to know how they could possibly have been guilty of so gross an absurdity, as to worship a

152 DISCOURSE I.

figure in the human or any other animal shape, if there had not been some original hieroglyphic composed of animal forms, or such an exhibition in the infancy of the world, as he supposes the *Cberubim* to have been. The true meaning and intention of which hieroglyphic, being in progress of time forgotten or mistaken, men came at length to worship the emblems themselves instead of what they represented.

BUT now it is easily conceived, how men in the early ages of the world (the Egyptians in particular) might make animals the symbols of the divine Nature and it's Attributes *; or memorials of their dead benefactors, kings and law-givers †. And this, though done at first only

* “ Prius quidem ista (sc. quadrupedum genera) pro
“ divinis habuere symbolis. Nec sapientiores fere pro-
“ gressi sunt ulterius. At vulgus paulatim eo est per-
“ ductum, ut illis quæ primo pro symbolis duntaxat
“ habita forent postmodo cultus divinus tanquam veris
“ numinibus præstaretur.” *Voss. de Idol.* Vol. I.
p. 561.

† There are several excellent observations on this head in Dr Warburton's *Div. Leg.* Vol. II. from p. 166. to p. 185. Where it is shewn, how the method in *Egypt* of recording the history of their hero-gods in improved hieroglyphics, gave birth to their idolatry in brute worship.

upon CHERUBIM. 153

only by way of instruction, or by way of record to posterity, might be the great source of *brute worship* among the vulgar in process of time. This is the account that learned men have all along given of the matter: and *they* and Mr *H.* agree in deducing all idolatry from mistaking hieroglyphical representations, only *they* ascribe the hieroglyphics chargeable with this pernicious and fatal consequence to human invention, and *he* to divine Appointment.

IN a word, whosoever will be at the pains to look over Mr *H.*'s collections of passages from, and references to, profane History, will not find, if I may judge from my own experience, the satisfaction that is promised by his friends; or a solid proof of any thing, but of the prodigious assiduity of the collector in picking up every little memorial of a *Bull*, or a *Lyon*, &c. glancing favourably towards his hypothesis, which either the ancient records and monuments of heathen superstition, yet extant, or conjectures upon them by modern authors, could furnish him with; in hopes of establishing them as avowed emblems

154 DISCOURSE I.

emblems of the several conditions of the
Airs, the Heavens, the Gentile *Rubbim*, and
that he might with the better grace apply
them in collateral proof of his own ac-
count of the *Cherubim*.

End of the First Discourse.

DISCOURSE

DISCOURSE II.
UPON
CHERUBIM.

SECT. I.

*Transition to the examination of Texts, al-
ledged in favour of Mr H.'s hypothesis.*

IT is said of Mr H. in the Defence of his Plan, p. 73. that “ before he “ came to, or thought of, the derivation of “ כרובים, he had proved that *that* figure “ was a picture, or hieroglyphical repre- “ sentation, of the persons in *Jehovah*, and “ of *him* that was to be, and now is taken “ into the Essence.”

THIS, I presume, is not spoken of any proofs to be met with in *his writings*; and they who choose to take their measures of judging from *them*, will make some difficulty of allowing that it appears from
thence

156 DISCOURSE II.

thence that he had proved *the thing*, independently of the *name*; but will be apt rather to think, from all they can gather out of *his Works*, that his exposition of this hieroglyphic, stands more upon the authority of his *own* interpretation of the word *Cherubim*, than it doth upon any other reasons he hath *there* assigned.

OF this, I apprehend, little doubt could have been made, if he had wrote in such order and method as other authors commonly write in, and had proceeded regularly from one point to another, connecting his proofs together, and laying them in a proper series. For had he stated his evidence in legitimate form, I conceive his whole argument, put in few words, would have stood thus.

1. A FIGURE compounded of four animal forms seen by *Ezekiel* in his visions, is by the Prophet himself stiled *Cherubim*.

2. BUT *Cherubim* literally signifies *sicut Rubbim*, or *likeness of the great Ones*.

3. AND *Rubbim* is a title of those divine Persons who are also called the *Aleim*.

4. BUT

upon CHERUBIM. 157

4. BUT *Aleim* literally signifies *fæderatores, persons in Covenant*.

5. So the *Cherubim* in *Ezekiel* is the picture or similitude of the divine Persons in Covenant.

6. THE union of the man with the lyon, or emblem of the second Person in the Essence, denotes the Covenant of Grace, and Redemption of Mankind.

7. HENCE this figure of the great Ones, is the Christian Covenant in Hieroglyphics.

8. MOSE'S *Cherubim* are the same in form with *Ezekiel's*.

9. CHERUBIM, wheresoever it is mentioned in Holy Scripture, imports a figure of the great Ones, or Christian Covenant in Hieroglyphics.

THIS seems to be the true state of his argument, when the several branches of it are orderly disposed: for which I appeal to every impartial reader of his works. And could these several points have been made out with that degree of evidence, which might reasonably have been expected from those encouraging expressions*,
by

* *Remarks*, p. 366. *Heb. Writ. Perf.* p. 23, & *alibi*.

158 DISCOURSE. II.

by which our attention is bespoke to the important discovery, the world had been greatly obliged to Mr *H.* But how far his labours in proving what he undertook, have answered the satisfaction he promised, his readers will judge for themselves. And if they will take the further trouble of perusing *these Dissertations*, it may possibly assist them in making a true judgment of the matter.

WITH respect to *seven* of the foregoing positions I have already spoken; and I flatter my self with thinking, that I have discovered and pointed out something in every one of them, that defeats it's respective use in the argument. And though it may not be said, perhaps, that I have absolutely broken any one link in the chain; yet, I fancy at least, I have so disconcerted their connexion, and weakened their force, that they will not be able to draw much conviction after them.

AND the *two last points* being in effect no more than an application of the construction of *Cherubim* built on the *former seven*, to those texts in Scripture where *that* word occurs, I shall now proceed to examine

amine with what justness and propriety such application of this construction is made: after I have premised, that it doth not follow, as Mr H. and his defenders seem to suppose, that every text or expression in Scripture which can be adjusted to their exposition of *Ezekiel's Cherubim*, is *therefore* a *direct proof* of the truth of their exposition, or a better proof of it than it is of *any other exposition* to which it can be *equally well* adjusted.

WE have already seen several attempts towards this kind of evidence, in their citing a variety of texts where רב and רבים are found applied, or are supposed by them to be applied to the Deity. Hence also it is that מראה אלהים becomes a *plain proof* of their construction, viz. because there is an interpretation of which the words are capable, that *plainly* corresponds with their sentiment and notion. Thus likewise תחת אלהים is another *plain proof*, when construed in their sense, *substitutio Dei Israelis*. The context, says one of them*, *requires it to be so taken*; that is, the words being capable of this acceptation, *must* have

* *Defence of Mr H.'s Plan*, p. 41, 47.

160 DISCOURSE II.

have it here, because their exposition cannot otherwise stand. And from thenceforward this **תחת** becomes a direct proof of the truth of their construction.

THUS again, the face of a man AND the face of a lion, with a supposition of such an union, or junction of the faces by the copulative *Vau* *, as may ascertain them both to the same person, furnishes out the explanation of that part of the vision, which had remained inexplicable on the mere force of the term *Cberubim*: and is treated from thenceforth, as one of the strongest proofs of the certainty of their hypothesis.

AND thus we shall generally find it in what is to follow. Their construction of the *Cberubim* in *Ezekiel*, being, as if it were by undoubted authority, transferred to other parts of Scripture, where *the word* occurs, or where *the thing* may be supposed to be understood from other expressions, receives *there* further illustration and additional improvements. Thus **שכן** and **פני** and **עדות** and **צבי** and **תעודה**, &c. being susceptible of an interpretation suitable

* *Remarks*, p. 373. *Answer to Observ.* p. 68.

able to their sentiment of *Ezekiel's Cherubim*, are not only translated agreeably thereto, but are propounded under such new translation, as fresh evidence of the certainty of Mr *H.*'s discovery.

AND here it is, that the observations on this subject that are made in the first chapter of *Elibu*, and in the *preliminary discourse* prefixed thereto, will fall properly under consideration.

THE learned Author of this Treatise is of so distinguished a character for his abilities, that whatever he says upon so curious and important a subject, as he himself confesses it, (*Elibu*, p. 21.) deserves to be closely attended to, and very thoroughly weighed. He owns his observations may appear new to many readers, but desires such to consider them with seriousness and impartiality, leaving them very candidly when that is done to their own judgment, *Prel. Disc.* p. 40. He seems himself to be intirely satisfied with Mr *H.*'s explanation of the *grand vision of Cbebar**, *Ezek. I.*

M

and

* " Which is an august image or representation of the
" Covenant, between the three Persons in the Deity with
" the man joined to redeem fallen man. This mysterious
" emblem

162 DISCOURSE II.

and looking upon it as an established approved construction, has confined his own remarks for *the better understanding and illustration of it*, to certain texts of Scripture which he thinks confirm it, and render it indubitable.

HE observes indeed that “some have *dared to doubt*, whether the descriptions “in *Ezekiel* are applicable to *these figures*” (*viz.* the *Cberubim*) “in the Scriptures.” *Prel. Disc.* p. 42.

Now so far as I may be supposed to have laid my self under the imputation of the presumption here noted, I must humbly apologize for my self, that to refrain from *doubts on some subjects* may not be in a man’s power, be he never so desirous to find out the truth. And whereas *this is a subject*, of which Mr *H.* says *it never was explained before*, and of which it is almost universally confessed that

“emblem gave such an explanation of this Divine Scheme, “as in some measure satisfied the senses, and answered “the common questions of—How can these things be?” *Elibu*, p. 20. “When I have added, that *Ezekiel* “says that *he saw this animal* under (תחת) *substituted for*, “or a representation of) *the God of Israel*, Who will “dare to assign him an inferior rank of Being?” *Prel. Disc.* p. 62.

that it never was *so explained* before, as to leave no room for doubt or further enquiry, I hope that the having *yet some doubts* about it, will not appear *so* flagrant a presumption.

Daring to doubt can only with propriety be said of such as *doubt without*, or *against*, *reason*; or who *pretend to doubt* when at the same time they are satisfied, or know at least where they may receive satisfaction. On such only let the censure fall. For my own part I *dare* do nothing but use my best endeavours (which I trust I may honestly do, though under a just sense of my own inabilities) to understand the Scriptures my self, and to explain them to others according to my talent such as it is. Neither am I *afraid* to propound my doubts, when I really have them, concerning any exposition of Scripture which appears to me novel and without good authority; though I would not willingly give any offence in doing so. And as to what I have wrote on this particular subject, (to make use of Mr *Locke's* words quoted at the conclusion of the *Prel. Disc.* p. 88.) “the reasons which
“led me into the meaning which pre-

164 DISCOURSE II.

“ vailed on my mind, are set down with it,
 “ as far as they carry light and conviction
 “ to any other man’s understanding, so far
 “ I hope my labour may be of some use
 “ to him : beyond the evidence it carries
 “ with it, I advise him, not to follow
 “ mine, nor any man’s interpretation.”

LET not therefore the learned Author of *Elibu* (whose abilities I must esteem, and on whose candour I will presume) be displeased at my re-considering those passages of Scripture which he has cited and commented upon, with a view to illustrate Mr *H.*’s exposition of *Ezekiel’s Cherubim*, and to establish the inferences that are drawn from it. I hope he will also excuse my not taking them in the very same order he hath laid them, but will allow me to produce them in their *proper places*, according to the plan I proceed upon, which is that of Mr *Catcot* in his Sermon, *p.* 14, and 15. who in his application of *Ezekiel’s Cherubim* to other texts, begins with a passage of the same prophet ; proceeds thence to the *Cherubim* at Paradise ; from thence to the *Cherubim* set up by *Moses*, and from thence to those mentioned in the New Testament. In
 pursuance

upon CHERUBIM. 165

purfuanee of which order, I fhall firft of all examine the texts that are cited out of *Ezekiel* who is our principal leader in this argument.

AND in the next place, thofe texts which relate to the *Cherubim*, before the giving of *the Law*;

AND in the third place, thofe texts which relate to *Cherubim under the Law*.

AND laftly, thofe texts which are cited on this fubject from the *Apoftles*, and Evangelifts.

166 DISCOURSE II.

S E C T. II.

Examination of passages cited from Ezekiel.

ELIHU, p. 21.—“The text of *Ezekiel* “ calls these emblems the likeness of “ four animals, (our translation says *living* “ *creatures*) from whence may be *demon-* “ *strated* the filliness and falsehood of the “ Jewish stories concerning *Angels*. Had “ they been really *such*, *Ezekiel* would “ not have prostrated himself before them “ in an act of religious adoration.”

IT is indeed thrice said that *he fell upon his face*; neither will it be doubted that he intended *worship* thereby, and that he paid it to God and not to angels. For it is *the glory of the Lord or the God of Israel*, and not the *Cherubim*, that is expressly mentioned in these texts where his adoration is related.

THUS

upon CHERUBIM. 167

THUS Ch. I. ver. 28. *This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it I fell upon my face.*

So Ch. III. 23. *I arose and went forth into the plain. And behold the glory of the Lord stood there, as the glory which I saw by the river of Chebar. And I fell on my face.*

THE like will be found in Ch. XLIII. 2. where the כבוד or *glory of the God of Israel*, is again mentioned as introductory to the prostration.

IT is true as the animal forms were a part of the same visions, *Ezekiel* must necessarily *prostrate himself before them* too, thought not in an act of adoration of them: as the homage which is paid to a king on his throne, is performed *before* but not *to* his footstool.

WHEN therefore it is asked—"would the Prophet have done this" (*viz.* have fallen upon his face) "to the material representative of an Angel? Or to an Angel himself?" *Elibu*, p. 25. The answer in my apprehension should be, no; there is no reason to ask the question, or to suspect he would. For

168 DISCOURSE II.

the object of his worship in these texts, was *God himself* appearing in these usual symbols of his Divinity, and not the animal likenesses that were *beneath that glory, or under the God of Israel.*

“*The glory of the Lord, and the Cherubim, are two distinct representations,*” as the defender of Mr H.’s plan rightly observes, p. 47. And as it was to the *first of these only*, that the prophet is said to have prostrated himself, it will not be easy to *demonstrate* from thence, *the silliness* of the *Jewish* stories concerning *Angels.*

THE next passage of this Prophet quoted in the same page of *Elibu*, viz. 21. is Ch. VII. 20,

AS for the beauty of his ornament be set it in majesty. But they made the images of their abominations and of their detestable things therein, therefore have I set it far from them.

THE next verse is likewise quoted which the reader may consult. But the description of the *Cherubim* is supposed to lie in the first clause of *this.* *The beauty of his ornament set in majesty.* For (*Elibu*, p. 22.)

“THE

upon CHERUBIM. 169

“THE word rendered beauty צִבִּי
 “Ze BI, signifies, according to Lexicogra-
 “phers, *Stockius*, &c. raised, embossed,
 “projecting work; *Cameratum currus*
 “*cameratus*, an arched or vaulted chariot,
 “*Quod supernè tectus speciem tumentis uteri*
 “*præ se fert*. (Note,—The root from
 “whence the idea is taken is I suppose
 “a tortoise.) It gives likewise the idea
 “of glory, pleasure, and beauty, joined, of
 “a crown and rich inheritance, and signi-
 “fies likewise an animal of a mixed na-
 “ture.

“THE word for ornaments (note,
 “וְיָ ODI, whose exposition according
 “to *Trommius*, &c. is *int. al. testis*, and
 “so testimony) signifies, Lexicons say,
 “the highest and most beautiful ornament,
 “a vesture of gold—The face or counte-
 “nance of God, *Os ejus*, B. 32—9—
 “103.” (Meaning as I presume, but
 false printed—*Buxt. Psal*, xxxii. 9.—
 ciii. 5.)

“THE word rendered majesty, is ex-
 “pressive of the original which would
 “point out the highest elevation, magni-
 “fience and excellency. *Elibu* therefore
 “in

170 DISCOURSE II.

“in *Job*, calls thunder the voice of the
“majesty of God.

“ALL these expressions describe the
“exhibition or representation, of the
“Divine Persons in the figures of the
“Cherubim. What else can they refer
“to?”

THEY refer to *the temple*, say the interpreters; and I think with good reason, since it is elsewhere called the *beauty of holiness**, and is very properly described by the terms here made use of. For the true meaning of this passage, will not depend upon certain particular senses of *these three words* which may be found *int. al.* in *Stockius* or *Trommius*, but upon their general use in Scripture, and more especially in this same prophetic writer.

THE first of them for instance צְבִי is used no less than five times in *Ezekiel*. In Ch. XX. the land of *Canaan* is twice said, ver. 6, and 15. to be צְבִי *the glory* of all lands.—The best part of the country of *Moab* is called Ch. XXV. 9. צְבִי *the glory* of the country.—And the restoration of conquered countries to a flourishing

* Psal. cx. 3.—xcvi. 6, &c.

ing state is denoted, as is commonly thought in Ch. XXVI. 20. by *setting glory* צב in the land of the living. Now when we find the same word used four times in the sense of *Decor, Gloria*; and applied to subjects that cannot bear the application in any very exalted sense, why must we construe it in a *fifth* usage of it by the same writer, under an idea of *raised projecting work, Currus cameratus, a tortoise, &c.** because the same word, or words from the same root, are found, or are fancied to be found, by some *Lexicographers* in all these different senses?

So

* Probably the ancient Hebrews had two words in their language, the one answering to the *Chald.* צבול *voluit, amavit, &c.* from whence they derived צב *Voluntas, Desiderium, Amor, Gloria, Decor, Ornamentum*; and the other answering to צב, a root, as I am informed yet extant in *Arabic*, signifying *clausit, obduxit, item intumuit, Distenta habuit membra, &c.* from whence might come צב *Currus cameratus*. Under this *Arabic* verb is likewise found the noun צב *Lacertæ Arabicæ seu Libyæ genus distentiore corpore et caudâ, eâdemque aculeatâ*, according to *Giggeius Crocodilus*: which may be the צב *Lev. xi. 29.* rendered by our translators *tortoise*, by the Gr. Κροκοδειλλος. According to these two different Etymologies, the best Lexicographers, *Kimchi*, and others, have ranked צב and צב under two different classes, though they have not given any good account of צב to justify their so doing.

172 DISCOURSE II.

So again עֲרִי signifies simply *ornamentum*, and though *the Lexicons* say it signifies *the highest and most beautiful ornament*, we have no reason to expound it in that *high sense* in this writer; because when he would amplify it, he repeats it, as in Ch. XVI. 7. עֲרִי עֲרִים the ornament of ornaments, or *excellent ornament*, as our translators have given it. Yet even when he uses it thus emphatically, he is not speaking of the *Cherubim*, but only of *Jerusalem*, or that city, *which men call the perfection of beauty, and joy of the whole earth*: as *Jer.* speaks *Lament.* ii. 15. And if so distinguishing an epithet might be given to the Holy City, much more may עֲרִי be truly said of the temple, without being taken in any degrading sense.

BUT the exposition (he says) of the word “according to *Trommius* is *int. al. testis, and so testimony.*” The exposition of עֲרִי is *testis*, but not of עֲרִי. Though how far עֲרִי and עֲרִי, which are commonly reputed different roots, may interchange significations, I will not say. But I may observe, with great truth, that *the exposition of the word, according to all the Lexicons, is int. al. ornamentum*: and
before

before this version be set aside to make room for *testis*, some reason should be given for it from the context. For as to the reason which is suggested in the note, p. 22. viz.—“ See what is said elsewhere upon this word, which, instead of ornaments, should be rendered, *his witnesses*, as the *Cherubim* were so in a most extraordinary and significant sense.” I believe, when it comes to be examined into, as it will be in its proper place, it will be found insufficient. And I shall only observe, in the mean time, that if the *Cherubim* were here characterised as *witnesses*, in a most extraordinary sense, they should have been, according to this Prophet’s stile, עֲרֵי עֲדִים; or dignified with the highest and strongest import, that the word under that acceptation is capable of bearing. But he never uses the word in this sense, or in any other, I think, than in that of *ornament*.

AND the other word גִּבּוֹר, which is here rendered *majesty*, is of more common usage with this Prophet, than either of the former. Eight or nine times it is used in a reproachful sense; for *pride*, or *haughtiness*, when applied to *Sodom*, chap.

174 DISCOURSE. II.

xvi. ver. 49. and 56. at other times for *pomp*, and in the way of rebuke, as in chap. vii. 24. xxx. 6. and 18. xxxii. 12. xxxiii. 28. In the remaining places, of which this is one, it is applied to the *Temple*: and is rendered agreeably to such application in both places. As chap. xxiv. 21. *Behold I will profane my sanctuary, the excellency [גאון] of your strength.* And it is no great presumption to say, it is applied to *the Temple* also, in the text under consideration, where our translators have rendered it by *Majesty*.

As to it's *pointing out the highest elevation, magnificence, and excellency, that* depends upon the nature of the subject of which it is spoken. When it is spoken of God, as in *Job*, it means *Majesty*, under the grandest idea we can possibly form to ourselves of that character. But what right have we to infer from the גאון in *Job*, as applied to God, that גאון in this place of *Ezekiel* should be applied to the *Cberubim*? Had it been a word so appropriate to the divine Majesty, as never to be used in any other inferior sense, it might have challenged *that* as it's proper construction in this place. But we see it's
usage

upon CHERUBIM. 175

usage is various, and among it's better senses it is used of the *Temple*, by this same Prophet. Or had we been obliged to look for it's meaning in other sacred writers, the most proper resort would have been to *Isaiah* lx. 15. *They shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the holy One of Israel* שְׁמִיךְ לְגֵאוֹן. *I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations.* Now as the expression in our present text is לְגֵאוֹן שְׁמֵרוֹ, these two passages have a much greater affinity with each other, than either of them have with a poetical expression in the description of thunder by *Elibu*, in the Book of *Job*.

So that I humbly conceive, from what has been hitherto said on these three words צַבִּי, עֵרִי, and גֵּאוֹן, that neither any of them singly, nor all of them together, have any necessary relation to the *Che-rubim*, but may be consistently understood, as they have generally been, of *the Temple*.

LET us now enquire into the other clause of the text, and examine the inferences that are made from thence.

ELIHU,

176 DISCOURSE II.

ELIHU, p. 23. "Then follows a
 "description of the abuse. *They made the*
 "images of their abominations, and of their
 "detestable things therein. It may, and I
 "humbly think, that the prefix ב here,
 "as in many other places, should have
 "the construction of *de, ex, secundum, or*
 "*juxta*. And then the sense is *clear, viz.*
 "that the *Jews*, from the symbol of the
 "Divinity, as from a pattern of the three
 "Persons, with the man joined to the
 "second, took occasion to found the wor-
 "ship of images, by making some such
 "for their private use, by worshipping of
 "which they hoped to obtain those blef-
 "sings which could come only from the
 "original figures."

SOME of the ancient versions prefer the
 construction of ב by *de, ex, &c.* but not
 in the notion of *juxta, secundum*, but ra-
 ther in *Grotius's* sense—*Quod in deco-*
rum ornatum & splendorem datum erat
ipsis DE EO imagines suas abomina-
biles ac spurcas fecêre. DE ISTO
auro & argento quo speciosi esse poterant
apud vicinos.

BUT what occasion can there be to de-
 part from the obvious meaning of ב
therein?

upon CHERUBIM. 177

therein? For it appears, if I do not greatly deceive myself, from what has been said, that כּוּ must relate to the Temple, and not to the *Cherubim*; (and so the *Chaldee* בִּידָה in eo.) and if it does, the sense is clear, as it is already given by our translation. And whosoever will compare this verse with the 11th of the vth chapter, viz. *Because thou hast defiled my Sanctuary with all thy detestable things, and with all thy abominations, &c.* (viz. by placing idols in the Temple, as Mr *Lowth* notes) will, I believe, be inclined to think there is no room left here for conjecturing, that the crime charged upon the *Jews*, was their worshipping images copied from the *Cherubim* for their private use.

BUT since it is said, *Elibu*, p. 24. "If the reader will consult the Critics upon this Scripture, he will find that very learned men favour the interpretation here offered." I shall forbear to add any more, and refer my reader to them, with wishes of better success to him in the search, than I have met with. For, having consulted all of them within my reach, and those not a few, I find nothing said to favour this construction, unless *Ju-*

178 DISCOURSE II.

nus may be thought to do so, who, upon the words in the text, *Decorem ornatus sui*, notes in the margin, “*i. e. Arcam Dei.*” which he afterwards explains, “*Ubi in arcâ fæderis excellentiam meam collocaveram.*” Or, as *Pole*, in his *Synopsis*, represents *Junius*, “*Arca fæderis symbolum præsentiae Dei, qui verus est decor & ornatus ecclesiæ.*” How far these expressions may be said to countenance the interpretation of this text by *Cherubim*, let others determine.

THE next text which is produced from *Ezekiel*, in *Elibu*, p. 24. is the same with which Mr C. begins his application of *Ezekiel's Cherubim*, to other parts of Scripture, and the same that Mr H. himself appeals to more than once.

“So, (says Mr C.) “A type of the “Messiah is by *Ezek. xxviii. 14.* stiled an “*Anointed Cherub.*” *Serm. p. 14.* This is alledged in proof, that Christ is properly one of the *Rubbin*.

MR H. cites the text to the same purpose, more peremptorily.

“NAY (says he) it is plain in the comparison, that *one* of these *Rubbin* was “the Messiah, *Ezek. xxviii. 14.* Thou
“art

upon CHERUBIM. 179

"art an image of the great One, anointed, a protector." *Glor. and Grav.* p. 163.

IT is the King of Tyre, who is here called *Cberub*. אֶתְכֵרוּב מִמֶּשֶׁח הַסּוֹכֵךְ. The same passage is quoted, something differently, in *Remarks*, p. 386. "Thou art like a great one מִמֶּשֶׁח, the anointer." And in Mr *H.*'s own edition of the said *Remarks*, p. 121. "Tu sicut רַב a great one, מִמֶּשֶׁח be anointing." Which last rendering, though more agreeable to his rule concerning *Mem* as always importing, when prefixed to a noun or participle, an agent, or instrument, doth nevertheless not well consist with his application of this text in reference to the Messiah.

AND neither of these versions are so certain as to exclude another given by *Junius* and *Tremellius*, in their Bible. viz. "Tu Cherub eras ex quo unxi te protectorem, ex quo præposui te," &c. or, ex quo ungi * (sc. te) protectorem, &c.

N 2

THE

* The former, *ex quo unxi*, given by *Junius*, is preferred by *Glassius*, *Philol. sacr.* p. 1664. And by *Jo. Froome*, *Diff. de Cherub. Thes. Theol. Philolog.* Vol. I. p. 120.

The latter, *ex quo ungi*, is the most agreeable to what follows in the next verse, concerning this King of Tyre, viz. מִיּוֹם הַבְּרָאָה From the day thou wast created, or constituted, &c.

180 DISCOURSE II.

THE learned Mr *Holloway*, in his *Originals*, Vol. I. p. 131. interprets this place as followeth. "Thou [hadst] the anointed *Cherub* that covereth: something that pretended to do, what *Christ* was to do."

HERE, again, is a reference to the Messiah, but put in another light; though whether to better advantage than in that in which Mr *H.* had first placed it in *Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 163. may be questioned.

HOWEVER, it appears from hence, that it is not altogether *so plain in the comparison*, that one of the *Rubbin* was the Messiah, as Mr *H.* conceived.

NEITHER is it *made plainer* in the comparison, when drawn out more at length, as I presume it is in *Use of Reason Recovered*, Part II. p. 130. Where Mr *H.* speaking of this Prince of *Tyre*, under the title of the *anointed Cherub*, from *this* text, and of the King of *Babylon*, under the title of *Lucifer, son of the morning*, from *Isaiab* xiv. 12. says,

"EACH of them is charged with setting up to be, what, perhaps, every heathen king expected to be, or to be treated like their $\gamma\alpha$, or irradiator. The material

upon CHERUBIM. 181

“material Fire, Light, and Spirit, or at
 “least two of them are called אֱלֹהִים.”
Exod. xv. 11. Psal. xxix. 1. and lxxxix. 6.
 “And the kings who worshipped them
 “are called their sons. And the question
 “is put, which of them is *like* the true
 “אֱלֹהִים, the irradiator, *the Son in Jehovah*
 “*Aleim*. And this affair is fixed, when
 “the Prince of Tyre imagined himself to
 “be אֱלֹהִים, *Ezek. xxviii. 2. Because thou hast*
 “*said, I am אֱלֹהִים the irradiator.* Yet thou
 “art אָדָם man, and not אֱלֹהִים.”

THE force of this reasoning lies a little too deep for my reach, at least I cannot be sure that I understand it right; and therefore I pass on to another view of the text, viz. that in which it is represented in *Elibu*, p. 24.

“THOU art the anointed Cherub that
 “covereth—I will destroy thee, O covering
 “Cherub. From these sarcastical rebukes
 “of the king of Tyre, we may conclude
 “that in the Cherubim, or divine Similitudes, there was *one Cherub* known or
 “distinguished by the titles of the *anointed*
 “Cherub, the *covering Cherub*. Other-
 “wise the Prophet’s allusion would have
 “been without foundation, and his satire

182 DISCOURSE II.

“without force. There would be no
 “contrast in the characters, had not a
 “person been pointed out who was truly
 “and emphatically stiled the *anointed* One,
 “or a figure referred to which represented
 “the *covering Cherub*, or great One. And
 “who could this be but the Messiah, who
 “was to cover or take away the sins of
 “the whole world?”

BUT now supposing the divine Similitudes *had been proved* in the *Cherubim*, the conclusion here drawn from *anointed*, and *covering Cherub*, may well be questioned, as it depends wholly on the English translation of two words that may be, and, indeed are, variously rendered, i. e. מִמְשָׁח and הַסֹּכֵךְ.

IT seems difficult to fix on any translation for מִמְשָׁח, because, as a noun, it occurs no where else: nor is the verb elsewhere extant in any conjugation of which it can be a participle. Therefore the word is not to be argued from, as if it were a common one of known signification. The LXX have neither a translation of this word, nor of הַסֹּכֵךְ. And the *Vulg.* translates מִמְשָׁח (as if it were read מִמְשָׁךְ)—*Extentus*.

IF another person, trusting equally in Mr H.'s skill, should abide by the other sense which he has given of these two words, upon his second thoughts, in his *Remarks*, viz. מַמְשָׁח *He anointing*, (or as his editors, *The anointer*;) and הַמוֹכֵךְ *Protector*. And should conclude from thence, that "in the *Cberubim*, or divine Similitudes, there was *one Cherub* known and "distinguished by the titles" of *the anointing Cherub*, *the protecting Cherub*; and should give this reason for such a conclusion, viz. "that otherwise the Prophet's allusion would have been without "foundation, and his satire without force:" Could this be thought a sufficient reason for admitting his conclusion as legitimate, and allowing him to build upon it, and argue from it, as from an uncontested principle?

SHOULD he proceed—to this effect, There had been no contrast in the characters, had not a person been pointed out who was truly and emphatically stiled *Cherub*; and who could this be but *the Anointer* represented in the hieroglyphic by *the Ox*, which was denominated by the Pro-

184 DISCOURSE II.

phet, *Cherub*, in distinction from the other animal forms?

THE answer, I presume, should be, that there is no such apparent connexion between this passage relating to the king of *Tyre*, and the vision of *Chebar*, (from the mere use of the word *Cherub* in either place;) as will warrant these inferences. There is no stress to be laid on the supposition that the rebukes of the *Tyrian* prince point to *Ezekiel's* visions. There may be other *allusions* intended, which may give *the Prophet's satire* it's full force; and there are other ways of accounting for the use of ממשח, הסוכך, and כרוב in this place, than by having recourse to the figures in the *Cherubim*.

AND I humbly apprehend this would be also a good answer to the inferences made from the same passage, in *Elibu*, p. 24. as quoted above, and elsewhere, ex. gr. in the *Prel. Disc.* p. 42.

“ SOME have dared to doubt whether
 “ the descriptions in *Ezekiel* are applicable
 “ to these figures in the Scriptures. But
 “ when that part relating to *the covering*
 “ *Cherub*, going from the threshold of the
 “ house (or temple *Beth*) into all lands,
 “ is

upon CHERUBIM. 185

“ is considered, *The doubt, I think, must*
“ *vanish.*”

AND *Eliku*, p. 25.

“ CAN it be doubted whose emblematic
“ representative this *anointed Cherub*
“ was, whereupon the glory rested.” &c.

BUT till the phrases, *covering Cherub*,
and *anointed Cherub*, be found in some
text besides those places relating to the
king of *Tyre*, The doubt will stand where
it did. And the applying these epithets to
the same word in other texts, and on other
subjects, without any other authority for
doing so, than a supposition that both passages
relate to the same thing or person, doth
not seem to be the best way “ *to prevent*
“ *mens disputing any longer the use of*
“ *these emblems.*” I might further observe
that, according to *Ezekiel's* stile, or manner
of expressing himself in regard to these
cherubic figures. The *Cherub*, whereupon
the Glory rested, must mean the compound
figure of four animals, and not the man
alone, or the lion and the man united;
which single observation, I believe, were
there no other, would exclude the distinction
of an *emblematical representative of the*
anointed Cherub in his visions.

THERE

186 DISCOURSE II.

THERE is one other passage in *Elihu*, p. 25. that must not be overlooked. *viz.*
 “Such therefore as have supposed these
 “figures to represent only common Angels
 “are hereby *unanswerably confuted*. For
 “unto which of the Angels hath God
 “said at any time—Thou art the anointed
 “Cherub that covereth—or O, covering
 “Cherub,—An Angel hath no better a
 “name to these incommunicable titles
 “than the arrogant king of *Tyre*.”

IT is true, so far as appears, this was *never said at any time* but to the king of *Tyre*; and upon what account, or in what sense it was said to him is now the question. They who interpret the *Cherubim* of Angels, and who also suppose this passage to be spoken in allusion to the *Cherubim*, will know how to interpret that expression suitably to that hypothesis, (as will be seen presently) although God never said at any time to the Angels that they were *anointed or covering Cherubs*. And they who interpret the *Cherubim* of Angels, but do not apprehend any allusion in this passage to the cherubic forms, will think themselves out of this question.

AND this leads me to offer some other
 accounts

upon CHERUBIM. 187

accounts of this much controverted place. Which to some persons may possibly give more satisfaction than what I have hitherto produced, from Mr *H.* and his followers.

THE first is that אִתְּךָ more regularly signifies in this place *with* than *thou* masculine, though it is indeed some few times put for אִתְּךָ. And this exposition of it by *with* is countenanced by *Sym.* and *Theod.* The *Syriac* renders by both, *thou wast with*, &c. So the LXX οὐ μετὰ σε εἶμι. It is also observable that the LXX join the first words of the verse with וְנִתְּתִיךָ not reading or not regarding the *Vau*, which other translators often disregard also, or put *even* instead of it. And *Noldius* sets down many places in which he says it is redundant. The translation therefore may run thus “with
“the anointed *Cherub* that covereth (*viz.*
“the mercy seat) I have set thee.” That is, I have placed thee in an high station and to be approached by few.

ANOTHER construction of the place may be offered, which is as follows.

ITHOBAL or *Ethbaal** was the
name

* ITHOBAL II. roy de Tyr regna du tems de Nabuchadonosor roi de Babylone. Il fut le dernier roi des Tyriens. — *Supplement de Moreri.*

188 DISCOURSE II.

name of this king of *Tyre*. He was the last prince that reigned there and was destroyed by *Nebuchadnezzar* as is foretold in this chapter. This name in Hebrew is אַתְּבַעַל, the same with that of the king* of the *Sidonians*, who was father of *Jezebel*, 1 *Kings* xvi. 31.

FROM his taking this name to himself, as one of his predecessors had done, and according to the custom of princes in those days, who took to themselves and gave to others the names of their gods, (of which there are several instances in the succession of the *Tyrian* kings as well as in other monarchies) and from his priding himself, as it seems, in this name אַתְּבַעַל as well as in other instances of his regal power and dignity, we may borrow a key that will open to us the meaning

* *ITHOBAL* I. Priest of *Astarte*, called by the LXX Ἰεθεβαλ. By *Josephus* Ἰθωβαλ. *Ant.* VIII. 13. By *Menander Ephesius* as cited by *Josephus* *cont. Apion.* Εἰθωβαλ. In like manner *Ithobal* the second, though not mentioned under that name in Scripture, is by *Josephus* styled, Ἰθωβαλ from *Philostratus.* *Ant.* X. 11. And Εἰθωβαλ from the *Phenician Histories, Cont. Apion* Lib. I. c. 21.

So that there seems no doubt but the name of this prince of *Tyre* was אַתְּבַעַל, or the same which was given to the first *Ithobal* in the book of *Kings*.

upon **CHERUBIM.** 189

meaning of the prophet's rebukes, without having recourse to any comparison between this king and the Messiah.

"*BECAUSE thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said I am a God,—Thou art אדם and not אל a man and not God.*

AND especially if it be true, and it is not at all improbable, that *the name* of this prince before he assumed the title of *Ethbaal* was *Cherub*, as Mr *Simon* tells us * in his *Biblical Dictionary*. And *Cherub* may be as well the name of a man here, as the name of one (*nomen viri, Romaine,*) in *Exra* † ii. 59. and *Neb.* vii. 61. To which I shall only add, that this supposition is countenanced by the *Targ.* on the place, where for *Tu Cherub unctus*, we read אֶת מֶלֶךְ מְרֻבָּא *Tu rex eveetus in regnum.*

THE Latin version indeed gives מְרֻבָּא here by *unctus*, but it is properly *auctus*, or *amplificatus*. But although this exposition of the place should not be thought the

* Le prophete Ezechiel dans le xxviii. ch. ver. 14. parle d'un certain *Cherub* roi de *Tyr* qui devint si superbe, &c.

Cherub ou *Isobal* regna durant trente deux ans.

† THESE are they that went up from *Telmelab*, *Tel-harfa*, *Cherub*, *Addan* and *Immes*.

190 DISCOURSE. II.

the most agreeable, there are others nevertheless that stand upon better reason and better authority than that of Mr *H.* I shall cite in the margin three or four * passages from other writers, which will take in all the principal constructions of this

* “ The prophet compares the prince of *Tyre* to a
 “ ruling or principal *Cherub*, one of the chief of the an-
 “ gelic order who attend upon God in Heaven; and are
 “ represented by the *Cherubims* in the Temple over-
 “ shadowing the mercy-seat. The words allude to the
 “ high advancement of *Satan* in Heaven before his fall,
 “ where he was placed in one of the highest orders of
 “ angels.—So *Isaiab*’s description of the fall of the
 “ king of *Babylon*, doth plainly allude to the downfall of
 “ *Satan* out of Heaven.” *Isa.* xiv. 12. *Lowth.*—
 “ Unde *Ezekiel* superbum *Tyri* regem hoc titulo (viz.
 “ *Cherub*) insignit primario angelo eum comparans.” *Calv.*
in Gen iii. 24.

GLASSIUS thinks the word *Cherub* here may have a two fold respect: one to the *Cherubim* in Paradise, mention being made of *the garden of Eden* in the verse immediately foregoing; the other, to the *Cherubim* in the Temple, mention being made of *the mountain of God* in this same verse. His words are,

“ Quidam ad imagines angelicas *Exod.* xxv. in sanctuario
 “ posites respici existimant cum in monte sanctitatis Dei
 “ positus esse dicitur; cumque סוכך obtegens, de
 “ *Cherubim* propitiatorii usurpetur. *Exod.* xxv. 20. Quid
 “ si ad utrumque (Horti quippe Hedenis antecedenti
 “ versu expressa fit mentio) respectus haberetur?” *Philos.*
sacr.

DEY.

upon CHERUBIM. 191

this place to which interpreters have severally inclined, (among which it may be seen, that they who interpret *the Cherubim of angels, are not unanswerably confuted by this text*) and shall leave the reader to determine for himself, whether or no any of them deserve better approbation than what was before offered.

As there is but one other text where *Cherub* is found in the singular, and must be metaphorically understood; and which, as I take it, is alledged by Mr *H.* as a proof of the Holy Spirit's being stiled separately *a Rub*, and consequently to be properly reputed one of the *Rubbin* in the Hieroglyphic, I shall briefly consider it here before we proceed to the texts where it is found plural.

THE

DEYLINGIUS proceeds in another way. viz. " Si
 " breviter dicendum est quod mihi in argumento adeo
 " difficili videatur, existimaverim vocem כְּרוּב proprie
 " valentem et robustum significare. Certe apud Syros כְּרוּב
 " id significat, et כְּרוּבוֹתָא potentiam, vires. Hoc sensu
 " occurrit *Ezech.* xxviii. 14. Ubi Deus regem Tyri ita
 " alloquitur—*Tu Cherub ex quo unctus es—perfectus es*
 " *in viis tuis ex die quo creatus es.* Hoc in loco vox Che,
 " כְּרוּב potenter manifeste notat; indicaturque
 " *Tyriorum reges ex quo Tyrus condita fuit præpotentes*
 " *fuisse.*" *Obs. sacr.* P. ii. p. 443.

192 DISCOURSE II.

THE passage is 2 Sam. xxii. 11. repeated in Psal. xviii. 11. And cited in *Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 162. as follows.

“I CALLED upon *Jehovah* and cried
 “to my *Aleim*; and he rode upon one
 “like *Rub*, a great one, and did fly, and
 “was seen upon the wings *רוח* of *the spirit*.”
 “From whence (he says) *it is plain*, that
 “the three agents, the emblems, the
 “names, of which the three beasts were
 “also representatives, are in another view
 “said to be *sicut Rubbim* (magnates) *sicut*
 “*Aleim*. These are the three agents
 “that formed the world, which the
 “Scriptures often speak of, and one of
 “them^{*} is called *the Word*, another *the*
 “*spirit of Jehovah*, which the apostate
 “Jews have ignorantly taken to be
 “*Cberubim*, animated angels, and called
 “them the Word,” &c.

HERE now he has drawn two conclusions subservient to his main purpose, which are, he presumes, to pass for further proofs of his construction of his *Cberubim*, though they have no other foundation but his construction of the *Cberubim* to stand upon.

THE

upon CHERUBIM. 193

THE first is, that the Holy Spirit is in Scripture language *a Rub*, because *the wind* (which he first renders the *Spirit*, and then refers to *the Spirit of Jehovah*) being the name or representative of the Holy Ghost is here stiled *Cherub*, or one like *Rub*.

THE other is, and he says 'tis plain that the Heavens, the names (which are according to him the primary emblems of the *Aleim*) are likewise *Cherubim*, although in another view; and in that view they are said to be *Cherubim*, or *sicut Rubbim*.

I DO not concern myself at present with his doctrine of the emblematical nature of *the names*, or conditions of the Heavens. This pertains to another branch of his discoveries, from the word שמים. But I would only beg leave to observe, that this text cannot be a proper foundation for forming either of these conclusions upon, without being taken in a sense so disagreeable to our ideas of the Deity, that no cloathing even of figurative expression can recommend it or reconcile it to them. How either the *Aleim* can be said to ride upon a represen-

O

tation

194 DISCOURSE II.

tation of themselves; or *any one person* of the Essence can be said to ride upon the image or similitude, or fly, or be seen upon the wings of *another person* of the same Essence, are questions too puzzling for sober reason to resolve; nor can the mind without some peculiar and extraordinary turn of fancy acquiesce in such a notion.

'TILL this matter therefore is better cleared up than it seems to be at present, there is no great temptation to depart from the interpretation of this text which is most commonly espoused, *viz.* that it is an exalted and poetical expression, in allusion to the *Chariot of the Cherubim*, and is designed to convey an idea * of God's exercising extraordinary power, or exerting himself with a peculiar energy.

S E C T.

* *Targ.* "Revelatus est in magnificentia suâ super Cherubim velocissimis, et duxit in fortitudine super alas
" מְדַיִּי *turbinis, Psal. xviii. 11.*

"Deus in sacris literis nunquam super *Cherubim* federe vel equitare dicitur, nisi cum illius potentia et fortitudo celebranda vel invocanda veniat. 1 *Sam. iv. 4.* 2 *Reg. xix. 15. Psal. xviii. 11. and xcix. 1.*" *Spencer, p. 764.*

"Equitatio super *Cherubim* Deo tribuitur cum de ventis procellis nubibus et tempestatibus sermo est, quibus hoc nomen ob vehementiam celeritatem et magnificos effectus tribuitur." *Glassius, Obs. sac. Metaph. ab Angelis, p. 665.*

S E C T. III.

Examination of Texts, relating to the Cherubim, before the giving of the Law.

MR C. in his Sermon on the *Elabim*, p. 14. transfers the cherubic forms described by *Ezekiel* to *Gen. III. 24.*

“ O V E R *these figures*, (says he) when
“ exhibited in the air to the east of *Eden*,
“ and at other times, &c.”

S o Mr H. (in his *Intr. to Mos. fine Princ.* p. 281.) “ The Bull, Lyon, Eagle,
“ and Man, were exhibited together ; im-
“ mediately after the man was sent out,
“ (*viz.* of Paradise) in the *Cherubim*, with
“ their bodies united, to represent that
“ great Mystery of the Unity, and Man
“ taken into the Trinity.”

196 DISCOURSE II.

BUT whence is it concluded that these figures of a Bull, Lyon, Eagle, and Man, were thus exhibited in the air? The name *Cherubim* doth not imply these figures in it, as hath been shewn above. Neither if these figures are supposed to have been exhibited at Paradise, doth it follow that they were *an image of the great Ones*, as hath been shewn also. They might, if there really was *such* an appearance, be forms assumed by angels *, for any thing Mr C. or Mr H. have shewn to the contrary.

THE defender indeed of Mr H.'s plan, has scarce any patience with those who presume to make a question, whether *Cherubim* always means the same figure, or compound form.

“ To suppose (says he, p. 50.) one Prophet doth not mean by *Cherub* what another doth, would authorize us to suppose, that they do not speak of the same God, though they use the same words.
“ You

* “ Qui suâ naturâ incorporei cum apparuerunt hominibus necessario diversas formas induerunt, nunc hominis, nunc leonis, nunc bovis, nunc aquilæ, nunc viri bellatoris & exterminatoris, prout exigebat ministerium ad quod mittebantur.” *Lamy de Tab.* p. 420.

“ You may as well suppose, that *Moses’s*
 “ God is different from *Ezekiel’s*, as that
 “ his *Cberubims* are.”—And again, *p.* 51.
 “ To say they did not mean the same fi-
 “ gure by the same appellation, is making
 “ the Holy Spirit to dictate to his scribes
 “ in a more vague shuffling stile, than
 “ the author of a riddle writes in. And
 “ what can be the consequence of such as-
 “ sertions, but justifying the enemy in
 “ making a jest of the word of God and
 “ us.”

BUT now, after he hath fully vented
 his displeasure, may one calmly ask whe-
 ther there was any real cause for it?

MAY not one Prophet mean by a word,
 what another, or himself elsewhere, doth
 not, without such dreadful consequences?
 If it be said *he may not*, I wish it were
 well considered what the consequences of
that assertion would be. However, I do
 not question, on this occasion, whether
Moses and *Ezekiel* mean in general, and in
 substance, *the same thing* by *Cberub*, but
 whether they mean the same figure or ap-
 pearance of it? and when *Ezekiel* calls the
 face of an Ox the face of a *Cberub*; the
 faces of the Man and the Lyon in the new

198 DISCOURSE II.

Temple a *Cherub* ; the living creature with four visages, a *Cherub* ; are we not at liberty to say, that his use of the word doth not precisely determine what is that particular image or representation which constitutes a *Cherub* ? nor, consequently determine, what was the particular form of the exhibitions called by *Moses Cherubim* at Paradise, or of the *Cherubs* placed by *Moses* on the Mercy-Seat ?

AFTER the most careful and diligent searches of learned men, they never could fix on any one precise figure which would answer to the uses of the word, and description of the thing in different parts of Scripture : for which reason, I presume, amongst others, *Aben Ezra*, cited by *Marius de Calasio*, and by *Pagnin*, gave it as *universale nomen ad omnem figuram* *.

I SHALL only add further, that people who are disposed, will find ways to turn any thing they list to *ridicule*, be it never
so

* “ Veteres Hebræi dixerunt כְּרוּבִים idem valere quod צִוְרוֹת, formæ vel figuræ. Et quod vox ille in Scripturis cum ך demonstrativo præfixo plerumque legitur ad “ imagines Arcæ impositas emphaticè & per eminentiam “ quandam denotandas, & ab aliis imaginibus vulgaribus “ discriminandas.” *Spencer*, p. 774.

so much above their scorn. And I will not answer for any of the expositions given of *Cherubim*, that it shall escape the wanton wit and raillery of such persons. But if one of them may be said *more* than any other, to give such men an handle for the exercise of their profane *genius* on this subject, I apprehend the exposition espoused by this Gentleman, is more likely to give it than any other is. But I will not assist them to take it, by explaining myself further.

WE are also told, in *Elibu*, p. 40. that “*Theodoret*, in his questions upon *Genesis*, speaks of this as a settled point, that “*Ezekiel’s* vision was a description of the “*Cherubim*.”

I WISH the passage or particular question, under which *Theodoret* speaks to this purpose, had been referred to.

THERE is, indeed, a quotation in question the 40th from *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, who thought that by the *Cherubim* placed at Paradise, we were not to understand angels, or any spiritual essences, but certain phantoms, or apparitions, in the shape of ghastly creatures, φοβερὰν ὄψιν καὶ μορφήν ὡσάνει τινῶν ζώων—ὥς ἑ ἀπειργεῖν τοῦ Ἀδάμ.—

200 DISCOURSE II.

The flaming sword, says he, “ was not
 “ real fire, but only seemed so. Nor were
 “ the *Cherubim* animals, ζωα, ἀλλ’ οἱ τοι-
 “ αὖτε, but they seemed so. Ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἰεζεκιηλ
 “ τέτραπρόσωπα τὰ χερουβὶμ ὀρα. For we find in
 “ like manner *Ezekiel* saw four-visaged
 “ *Cherubim*; but four visages express not
 “ the nature of any invisible Being. What-
 “ ever is powerful in operation he calls
 “ *Cherubim*. Χερουβὶμ καλεῖ πάν το δυνάσιν. Thus,
 “ he sitteth upon the *Cherubim* means, he
 “ powerfully reigns. He rode and flew
 “ upon the *Cherubim*, means he came
 “ with mighty power.”

NOTHING is spoken here of *Cherubim*
 as a settled point, unless it be, that the
 word meant πάν το δυνάσιν, of which, who-
 soever can make any good use, may, and
 ought to do so.

BUT *Theodoret*’s own opinion of the
Cherubim was, that they were *angels*, or
 representations of *angels*. He applies to
 them, *Psal.* ciii. 20. “ Bless the Lord, ye
 “ his *angels*.” מלאכיו. And, *Coloss.* i.
 “ *Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and*
 “ *Powers*.” Vol. II. *F. Sirmond*’s edition,
 p. 311, and 312. He speaks of them as
powers that support and carry the emblems
 of

upon CHERUBIM. 201

of Divinity, τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ σχήμα φερούσων δυνάμεων, *ibid.* p. 310. And of the divine Glory riding upon them, Τῆς Θείας Δοξῆς ἐποχουμένης τῶν Χερουβιμ. *ibid.* p. 345. And of their images, Εἰκασμάλα, in the Tabernacle, being *types* of spiritual Powers, τυπὸν τῶν αἰσωμάτων Δυνάμεων ἐχούλα. Vol. I. p. 105. He says, indeed, of *Ezekiel's* ζῶα, that εἴρα διὰ τούτων ἀνιτίεται, viz. by the *Lion*, *Regality*; by the *Ox*, the *Priesthood*; by the *Eagle*, *Prophecy*; but we have no occasion to consider his manner of allegorizing. And therefore, I return to the argument.

SUPPOSING it were a *settled point*; supposing it were certain that the *Cherubim* in Scripture were always to be understood as having the same form or figure, and consequently, that the *Cherubim* at Paradise was an appearance of the same animals that are described in *Ezekiel's* visions; yet they are as naturally, and as easily explained under this supposition, of *Angels*, as they are of a picture or hieroglyphic of the Trinity.

MR C. proceeds. "Over these figures, "when exhibited in the air to the east of "Eden, and at other times, appeared a
"light

202 DISCOURSE II.

“light brighter than the sun; which sent
 “out rays as from a center; and the light
 “in irradiation or glory, was ever the em-
 “blem of Divinity. This was the first
 “*Shecinah*, the visible residence of the
 “Divine Presence.”

HERE is a great deal raised out of
 את להט החרב המתהפכת *.

HAD he interpreted this of a *Seraph*,
 as some have done, the words being of the
 same signification, [להט a *burner* or *burn-*
ing

* And Mr *H.* makes a great deal more of this exhibi-
 tion. *Glor. and Grav.* p. 143.

“This appearance,” says he, “was certainly compleat,
 “comprehended hieroglyphically *all* that was to be be-
 “lieved and observed, *all* that was necessary to be known
 “of the Covenant; *all* the institutions; *all* that was
 “typically exhibited before, or in the Tabernacle or
 “Temple; *all* they represented above, and all that was to
 “be really performed below.” &c.

See more to the same purpose, *ibid.* p. 135. and else-
 where.

Here also *the ark* was exhibited, from whence *all arks*,
 according to Mr *Holloway*, viz. *Noah's ark*, and the ark
 of bulrushes made by *Moses's* mother, took their birth.
 “For these arks, says he, were all from one original, viz.
 “from that which was part of the Cherubic exhibition
 “over Paradise.” *Orig. Vol. I.* p. 160.

But it is observed, in the *Preh. Disc.* to *Elibu*, that
 “as there was no written law or testimony before,” (viz.
 the two Tables) “there was no such use for an ark.”

ing †. *Glor. and Grav.* p. 137. שרף a burning, or a fiery one. *Heb. Writ. perf.* p. 378.] the construction had been easier admitted from the relation which hath been generally acknowledged, and which our public Service implies between *Seraphim* and *Cberubim*; and from it's being elsewhere said, that God *maketh his Ministers* (אש להט *Seraph* ad verbum, *Dan. Heinsius, Exerc. Sac.*) a flame of fire, *Psal.* civ. 4. But the word, I think, is never used of *that glory*, "which was ever the emblem of the Divinity." The divine Glory is called in Scripture כבוד, and by the Jews and other writers *Shecinab*.

WHICH last word, viz. *Shecinab*, as thus commonly applied to the visible manifestations of the divine Presence in Glory, has given Mr H. an opportunity of disputing the translation of שכן in this passage, where the *Cberubim* are first mentioned.

" THIS

† אש להט is not as they have made it, a participle, *flaming*, nor has it any relation to the edge of the sword; the verb is *to burn*, so the *burner*, as an emblem the action of *burning*. The idea is taken from withering, or scorching by the violent heat of the sun. *Glor. and Grav.* P. 137.

204 DISCOURSE II.

“THIS (says he) is the first time the
 “word שכן is used. And this was the
 “first *Shecinab* which signifies a place of
 “dwelling, a center, and the goings out
 “and comings in, or as an agent that
 “which irradiates, and so circulates, and
 “which the Jews talk so much of, and
 “which now they apply only to כבוד,
 “rendered *Glory* (upon which in it's place)
 “to put a blind upon each.”——*Introd. to*
Moses's sine Princ. p. 282.

HENCE we find Mr C. in his Sermon,
 p. 14. translating Gen. iii. 24. in these
 words, viz. “Jehovah Elahim, *Jishean*
 “*will inhabit the Cherubim.*” And in his
Answer to Obs. p. 75. “From thence
 “forward *inhabits the Cherubim.*”

MUCH hath already passed * between
 him and Mr *Bedford* and others, about
 the construction of this word in this place;
 the upshot of which, when the dispute
 about the pointings is laid aside, is this,
 that שכן must be understood in other
 places, as appears by instances, sometimes

as

* See B.'s *Observations*, p. 24, 25.

Mr C.'s *Answ. to Observations*, p. 73, 74, 75.

Mr H.'s *Remarks on the Observations*, p. 96, &c.

Examination, p. 52, 53, 54.

Examiner Examined, p. 86.

as the future in *Kal*, and sometimes as if it were in the mood *hiphil* *, i. e. sometimes *he will dwell*, and sometimes *he caused to dwell*, or placed, &c. And which of these renderings is the most proper, either here or elsewhere, depends upon the context ; or, if that will equally bear either rendering, it must be determined from other considerations, or remain uncertain.

AND I believe, whosoever attends to the sense and drift of the context, will think the common version by *placed*, or *made to dwell*, preferable to the other of *inhabiting*.

WHAT

* The usual mark of the *hiphil* conjugation in most verbs, viz. *the Jod* before the last radical letter (as in וְשָׁכַן) is wanting, as *Examiner Examined* justly observes upon the passage under consideration. And yet there is but *one* instance (and he gives it) in which the *Jod* is retained, though there be more than one in which the *Jod* is omitted, even where the context requires it to be understood in *Hipbil*. Ex. gr. "He cast out the heathen also before them, and made the tribes of *Israel* to dwell in their tents." The *Hebrew* word here (viz. *Psal.* lxxviii. 55.) is וְשָׁכַן, the same with that now in dispute. I do not undertake here to account for the omission of the *Jod*, farther, than by saying, that it happens frequently in other verbs as well as this, and that as the word is without it in one text, it may be without it and in the same sense in another. And Mr B. was certainly right in his claim to most of the versions, as on his side.

206 DISCOURSE. II.

WHAT Mr *H.*'s and Mr *C.*'s views were in observing that *Jehovah* would inhabit *אֵל* the substance of the Cherubim, (See *Remarks*, p. 362. *Answer to Obs.* p. 75.) I do not well know, unless it be to intimate that his more immediate or special presence was *within* the exhibitions in the air over Paradise, and within those other exhibitions supposed by our Author at other times till the giving of the Law, and afterwards *within* or *throughout* the substance of the solid Cherubim upon the Mercy-Seat. Of which last *Examiner Examined* says "that the substance of the Cherubim is a very proper expression, because they were made of gold, or materials that had a substance." p. 44.

AND no doubt the idea of such an extraordinary presence in the Cherubim themselves, as is conceived, for instance, to have been in the *burning bush*, or in the *cloudy pillar*, will sooner reconcile us to the hypothesis of their being the similitudes of *Rubim*, than the idea of a Divine Presence exhibited *over them*, or *between them* will do; and will also much better suit with what Mr *H.* ascribes to them in other places, as that *the oracle was in them* —that

—that responses came from them—that a voice issued * from them, (*Use of Reason*, Vol. I. p. 56, 57.) that Adam and his sons had them for their guide. (*ibid*, p. 111.) I say the supposition of such *Divine Presence* and *Divine Powers* lodged as it were in the *Cherubim*, corresponds extremely well with the notion of their being the *similitude or image of the Divine Persons*, and propounded to mankind as such. But to infer

* THAT it may be seen to what lengths this notion of God's presence in the *Cherubim* may be carried after it is once imbibed, I shall transcribe from the 9th Vol. of Mr H.'s Works, p. 371. a marginal note upon these words in *Psal cxv. 5. They have eyes and see not, they have ears but they hear not, noses have they but they smell not, &c.* which is spoken of the Heathen idols, which were silver and gold, the work of mens hands, ver. 4. and are opposed here as the Annotator suggests to the images of the Hebrews or the *Cherubim*.—"The images, (says he) as to *substance* and *form* were the same, or nearly so on both sides."—"And as the images of the Jews had the *presence in them*, so spake with their mouth, saw with their eyes, smelt with their nose; or, as the *Aleim* performed those several powers *though the image*; the heathens are challenged here to shew a *presence in their images*: and as they could not, it is asserted to be the same thing as if they had no other object of worship but their images of gold and silver; the *Aleim*, of whom they made those hieroglyphical figures representatives, not being able to exert any of those faculties at discretion, which the hands, eyes, feet represented, and which the *Aleim* of Israel did upon all occasions."

208 DISCOURSE II.

infer this from **אֵת** **יֹשֵׁב** or any like Scripture phrase, is building, I fear, too largely on very narrow grounds.

IT hath not been proved that in any one place of Scripture **אֵת** signifies the *substance* of any thing. Where *substance* is meant, it would be equally meant if **אֵת** were omitted. Or were this otherwise, yet it occurs in places innumerable where it doth not signify *substance*, and where it would be absurd to put that term: where in short it only denotes the accusative case. And therefore nothing concerning the *substance* of the *Cberubim* can be concluded from the use of it here. No one I suppose would translate **אֵת** **יֹשֵׁב** **שְׁמִי** *Neb. i. 9.* “to make the *substance* of my name dwell there.” Nor when the *Jews* were directed to make **אֵת** **הַכְּרֻבִּים** *Exod. xxv. 19.* can it mean the *substance* of the *Cberubim*, but *the form only*.

יֹשֵׁב **הַכְּרֻבִּים** is another phrase often quoted with the same view, concerning which I would observe first, that God is never described as **יֹשֵׁב** **אֵת** **כְּרֻבִּים**, which is a strong presumption that **אֵת** hath no such peculiar emphasis when joined with **כְּרֻבִּים** in *Genesis*. But secondly, even had

had יושב את כרובים been found in Scripture, it would not have justified a translation by *the substance of the Cherubim*. We find in Gen. xlvii. 6. הושב את אביו, and Ezek. xxxvi. 33. והושבתי את הערים, yet surely we ought not to translate, *cause the substance of thy father to dwell*, or *I will cause you to dwell in the substance of the cities*.

BUT to speak now of the phrase which is found in Scripture יושב הכרובים. It must be owned indeed that the LXX, who most commonly render it by — οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν τῷ χερουβίμ, and the *Vulgate* which gives it *sedens super Cherubinos*, and the *English* which expresseth it by *who sitteth*, or *dwelleth between the Cherubims*, do all of them abound in respect of the prepositions ἐν, *super* and *between*; there being no corresponding prepositions in the original; and that the Hebrew literally expresses no more than—*Habitans Cherubim*, as יושב אהל Gen. iv. 20. is *Habitans tentorium*.

BUT then this will not imply or necessarily import such a local presence *within the substance* of the *Cherubim* as is above intimated. It must be understood

P

like

210 DISCOURSE II.

like the following phrases viz. יושב הארץ *Num. xiv. 14.* or יושב ההר *Joshua x. 6.* which signify dwelling *on the earth* or *in the mountain*, and not *within the earth* or *in the substance of the mountain*. So when God is said to inhabit the Cherubim, it is to the same effect as when he is said יושב ציון *Psal. ix. 12.* to dwell in Zion. See *Spencer*, p. 793.

INDEED our Translators seem to have used the most proper phrase, *between the Cherubim*, noting at the same time by putting the preposition in *Italic's* that it is not expressed, but is implied in the original. For since it is said, *Exod. xxv. 22.* and *Numb. vii. 89.* "I will meet thee" מעל הכפרת "and will commune with thee" מבין שני "from above the mercy-seat" הכרובים *de inter duos Cherubinos*, from between the two Cherubims, it should seem as if the seat of the Presence was (as *Lud. de Dieu* explains it) the void place between the cover of the ark, and the Cherubims wings which overshadowed it. And this gives an idea that answers altogether as well to יושב הכרובים as the dwelling in a tent answers to יושב אהל. In short, the more determinate phrase from between the Cherubim, forbids us to understand

upon CHERUBIM. 211

understand the less determinate one *inhabiting the Cherubim*, to signify inhabiting the substance of them.

M R C. proceeds, on supposition of the the afore-mentioned figures being exhibited at Paradise, *p.* 14.—“ These “ are the *visages of Jehovah*, which so “ often occur in Scripture, and which our “ translation renders *before the Lord*.”

ONE would be apt to conclude from reading this, that פני יהוה the Heb. for the *visages of Jehovah*, was commonly mistranslated in our version, at least that justice was not done to the original therein. And as this is often insinuated by other writers on the same side, I shall beg leave to put in a word here in favour of our version, and to do justice to our translators.

WHEN פני *without a prefix* is used with *Jehovah*, they do not render it *before the Lord*, but by *face or countenance* * : or

P 2

if

* GEN. xix. 13. The cry of them is waxed great *before the face* of the Lord.

1 KINGS xiii. 6. Intreat now *the face* of the Lord. Psal. xxxiv. 17. *The face* of the Lord is against them that do evil.

NUM. vi. 25, 26. The Lord make *his face* shine upon thee. The Lord lift up *his countenance* upon thee. פני in both places.

212 DISCOURSE II.

if at any time they put not *face* into the text, they put it into the margin*. And this if I mistake not is their rule throughout the Scriptures. Even where פני is applied *without a prefix* to any thing that will bear rendering by *face* in the English language they take care so to render it, as *face* of the *ground*, Gen. ii. 6. of the *world*, *Isaiah* xiv. 21. of the *house*, *Ezek.* xli. 14. But when פני is used *with prefixes*, as it very frequently is, as לפני, and מפני, and מלפני; or with prepositions את-פני and על-פני and על-לפני † in the sense of *coram*, *antequam*, *contra*, *cum*, *extra*, *propter*, &c. and is used with *these prefixes*, or with *these*

* EXOD. xxxii. 11. Moses besought the Lord. In the margin. Heb. *the face of the Lord*.

2 SAM. xxi. 1. David enquired of the Lord. Marg. Heb. *sought the face*. The like in 1 Kings xiii. 6, &c. And it is remarkable in this text of *Kings*, which I twice quote here, that as יהוה פני twice occurs in the verse, our Translators have in the first instance put *face* in the text; and in the other they have put it in the margin. *And the man of God besought the Lord. Marg.—The face of the Lord.* Which shew how little stress they laid on the word פני in these uses of it.

† WHOSOEVER will give himself the trouble of looking into *Noldius's* Concordance of the Hebrew *particles*, will find under לפני alone near twenty different usages of it in different places of Scripture, and some very good remarks upon יהוה פני in particular; see his *notes* at page 1918.

upon CHERUBIM. 213

these prepositions of time, or place, or things not persons, and where consequently a translation by *visages* or *faces* would appear absurd, there they render it by some English preposition, *before*, *with*, *against*, or *in the presence of*; as best agrees with the context and apparent scope of the passage.

Now those *visages* of *Jehovah*, which Mr C. interprets of the *Cberubic faces*, are only gathered from מלפני יהוה Gen. iv. 16. (from the presence of the Lord, says our translation, and not from before the Lord) compared with ver. 14. מפניך (from thy face, says our version, not from before thee) אסתר I shall be hid.

Thus Mr H. *Glor. and Grav.* p. 145. "Now" (says he, viz. understanding the *Cberubim* of the *Divine faces*) "we understand passages which could have no other sense. As when Cain says Gen. iv. 14. from thy faces shall I be hid. Ver. 16. And Cain went out from the faces of the Lord."

So in *Elibu*, p. 23. (vide note.) "He viz. Cain, " was driven from the FACES of GOD. What could these be but " the *Cberubim*."

AND פני says Mr H. in *Heb. Writ. perf.* p. 420. is " properly used for persons

214 DISCOURSE II.

“in these emblems.” But try the version by *faces* or *persons* upon *Ezek. x. 14.* פְּנֵי הָאֶחָד פְּנֵי כְרוּב the first *faces* were the faces of a *Cherub*. The second *faces*, &c.——Certainly פְּנֵי, though a noun plural, is no proof of *more visages* or *more persons* than *one*; for though it be always plural in sound or termination, yet it hath most commonly a singular sense. And our Translators have taken due care always to distinguish between the singular and plural sense of it, and to render it accordingly. And in this place, viz. *Gen. iv. 14.* there is no more reason (exclusive of Mr *H.*’s hyphothesis) why מִפְּנֵי אֶסְתֵּר should be rendered “from *thy faces* shall “I be hid,” instead of *thy face*; than there is why the same expression in *Job*, viz. *xiii. 20.* לֹא אֶסְתֵּר מִפְּנֵי should be rendered “I will not hide myself from “*thy faces*” instead of *thy face*; (unless the *Cherubic* faces can be supposed also to be meant there) or than there is to translate *Gen. xvi. 6.* that *Hagar* fled from *Sarah*’s *faces*. For the word is מִפְּנֵיהָ. Neither is there any more reason to render מִלְּפָנֵי יְהוָה ver. 16. of *Cain*’s going out from the *faces* or the *persons* or *Jehovah*, than there

there is to render—פָּרְעֵה מִלְּפָנֵי Gen. xlvii. 10. or מִלְּפָנֵי מֹשֶׁה Exod. xxxv. 20. from the *faces* of Pharaoh, or *persons* of Moses. But according to Mr H. each *face* even of a *Cherub* ought to be rendered *faces*. *

THE question is not, (as the attentive reader will easily observe) whether פָּנִי might not be rendered plural, on supposition that it related to *Cherubic faces*; for certainly in that case it ought to be so rendered; but the question is, whether it's being capable of a plural sense, as well as of a singular, be any proof, or proper indication, that it really relates to the *Cherubic faces*? If those *visages* be first proved, no exception will lie against Mr H.'s translation. But there is no reason the translation should be altered to be any proof of his hypothesis.

P 4

MR

* AND in his translation of Ezek. i. 10. he gives a notable specimen of his adherence to this rule. "The *faces* of the man, and the *faces* of the lion upon the right to the four of them, and the *faces* of the bull to the left of the four of them, and the *faces* of an eagle to the four of them." *Remarks*, his own edition p. 108. Yet in the next page he thought proper to depart from this rule, and render פָּנִי in the singular by *face*; for quoting Ezek. x. 14. (*ibid.* p. 109) he doth it in these words. The first *face* was the *face* of a *Cherub*. The second *face* was the *face* of a man.

216 DISCOURSE II.

MR C. proceeds "these were they
 " (visages) *from the presence of which Cain*
 " so greatly dreaded to be driven, for as
 " they had answers from these, worship-
 " ped towards them, and had their sa-
 " crifices accepted by fire streaming down
 " from them, and consuming the victim ;
 " so to be hid from these faces was an ex-
 " communication."

ON what grounds he asserts all these things to have happened in these early times I know not.

SEE Mr H. to the same purpose, *Heb. Writ. perf.* p. 421. And the note in p. 23. of *Elibu*, where it is expressed more cautiously in these words. "From the
 " Scripture account of *Cain's* banishment,
 " *it is highly probable* that there was then
 " a place set apart for religious worship,
 " and the *Cherubim* placed therein.—
 " And by this explusion or excommunica-
 " tion he was deprived of the blessing of
 " any atonement for sin," &c.

BUT allowing the expressions in these texts to mean *Cain's* excommunication or exclusion from the place of publick worship, where also there probably was, at least on extraordinary occasions, some visi-
 ble

upon CHERUBIM. 217

ble presence of God ; may not *Cain* be said to be *hid from*, or to go out from the presence of Jehovah, without a supposition of four visages exhibiting *that presence* ? What Mr C. says immediately after is very true, that “ in the sense of Omnipresence, *Cain* “ could not be hid from the face of God.” But is there no medium between Omnipresence physically considered, and a presence by visages of animal creatures ? When it is said, “ behold thou hast driven me out this day *from the face of the* “ *earth* ;” מעל פני האדמה. Is there no *middle sense* in which this can be understood, without running into the *extreams* of the face of the *whole earth* on the one hand, or the face of the *man in the Cherubim* * on the other ? It is justly observed in the abovementioned *note* at p. 23, *Eliku*,—“ this cannot be understood of the “ *earth in general*, but of some *particular part*, which is called THE “ ADAMAH.”

* “ EVERY one knew that *Cain* could not be driven “ out from *the faces of the earth* ; NOW we know whose “ *the visage* of האדמה, the red one, or of the substance “ of earth put before, and joined with the visages of *Jehovah*, was ; from whom he was ejected in several “ senses.” *Heb. Writ. perf.* 421. I forbear to make any remarks on this interpretation.

218 DISCOURSE II.

“ADAMAH.” Perhaps it was a *part* distinguished as being his native country, *the Adamah* he had tilled, and reaped the fruits of, see ver. 2d, and 3d. of this chapter. And it is frequently used for a *particular region, land, or country*. In the like manner I apprehend, there is a Divine Presence, which may be distinguished both from Divine Ubiquity, and from external exhibitions, or emblematical faces: And that *Cain* may be said in a very proper, as well as in a very dreadful sense, to be hid *from the Presence* of the Lord, when he was deprived of God’s Grace and Favour, Protection and Blessing.

WHEN it is said, *Gen. vi. 11.* that the earth was corrupt *before God* לפני אלהים (and here we have an instance of that rendering, which Mr C. seems to blame in our version). This cannot mean that all flesh, which, as is expressed in the next verse, had corrupted his way upon earth, was in the immediate presence of the *Che-rubim*, or hieroglyphical figures, but only that all flesh was corrupt in God’s sight. “*God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt,*” ver. 12. And God said unto *Noah*, chap. vii. ver. 1. *I have seen thee*

upon CHERUBIM. 219

thee righteous *לפני* before me * in this generation. Doth this imply cherubic faces?

THE author of *Thoughts concerning Religion* says, p. 83, 4to Edit. — “ It is
“ not to be dissembled, that the Hebrew
“ words translated *before the faces*, are of-
“ ten made use of to signify *before*, or *in*
“ *presence of*, without regard to plurality
“ of faces; but (says he) it deserves en-
“ quiry, how so strange a phraseology
“ came to take place.”

A BETTER answer, I believe, may be given to this enquiry, than that the phraseology was taken from the visages of the *Cherubim*. Nor is the phraseology so strange, though the plurality of the word for *face*, viz. *פנים* is peculiar to the Hebrew. *Ενωπιον* and *κατενωπιον*, compounded with the genitive of *ὦψ*, *ὠπος*, *Oculus*, *aspectus*, *facies*, &c. in the sense of *coram*, is, in all other respects, a like instance. The common phrase, I am told, in *Arabic* to express *before*, or *in the presence of*,
is

* So *Δικαιοὶ ἐνωπιὸν τῷ Θεῷ*. *Luc. i. 6.*

Καρδία σου ἐκ ἐστῆς εὐθείας ἐνωπιὸν τῷ Θεῷ. *Acts viii 21.*

Ἡμεῶν ἐνωπιὸν σου. *Luc. xv. 18.*

See more of these instances in *Leusd. Phil. Heb. Græc.*
p. 108.

220 DISCOURSE II.

is *between the hands*. Thus in the texts quoted above, Gen. vii. 1. לפני is rendered by the *Arabic* translator *between my hands*. And in the other text, Gen. vi. 11. לפני אלהים *between the hands of God*. And the same in Gen. x. 9. quoted below, and in other places. If we cannot account for this phraseology, will it follow that it took it's rise from some representation of God with the hands of a man?

LET me only observe further, with respect to מלפני יהוה, Gen. iv. 16. and לפני אלהים just now produced from Gen. vi. 11. that they cannot, upon Mr C.'s own principles, be understood of the *cherubic faces*, or the *same visages* which are described by *Ezekiel* in his visions; because for the very reason given by Mr C. why *Ezekiel's Cherubim*, including the man's visage, *could not be called Cbe-Elabim*, nor consequently, *Che-Jehovah*, viz. "As man was not a party in making of the Covenant, nor a person of the Essence," it follows, that these words לפני אלהים and מלפני יהוה cannot be understood of *that same compound figure*; which when rightly expressed, should have been לפני רובים (if there were any Scripture authority for that word),

word), and which indeed *must* have been so, if Mr C.'s interpretation of that figure, *with his illustration of it from the name*, stand good.

HE had no room in his Sermon to proceed to other instances of our mistranslations by *before*, instead of *to the faces* of the Lord. But this defect is supplied by other hands, who have taken care to point out the obnoxious passages relating to the patriarchal state: which I shall now consider.

THE next in order is, I think, *Gen. x. 9.* where it is said of *Nimrod*, that he was a mighty hunter *before the Lord*, לפני יהוה that is, as most commonly understood, a man of violence and oppression *in God's sight*; (in the same sense that was lately given to a parallel text, "the earth *was corrupt before God,*" or *in God's sight.*) so *Montanus. Interl. Vers. in conspectu Domini.* (which explains what he means by *ad facies Domini*, which is his other translation of the same words, in the same verse.) But Mr H. is pleased to bring this among the passages which *are now at length understood, and can have no other sense* than what he gives them. "He
" was

222 DISCOURSE. II.

“ was a mighty hunter *after the faces of*
“ *Jehovah*, that is, in finding, taking, and
“ destroying the emblems, *the faces.*”
Glor. and Grav. p. 145. So also Mr *Hol-*
loway; “ Nimrod, and all apostates and
“ seducers since have been term’d *hunters,*
“ *mighty hunters, before or against the faces*
“ *of Jehovah.*” *Orig. Vol. II.* p. 191.
But neither of them attempts to support
his construction by any other text, where
taking and destroying *the faces* of the Lord
is mentioned.

AND whereas we are taught by the last
named author, in another place, *Orig.*
Vol. I. p. 366. that “ the phrase *before the*
“ *Lord*, without some note of difference
“ added, ordinarily signifies before the
“ divine Presence, with the cherubic faces
“ in the Sanctuary;” and may thence in-
fer, that there are certain *notes of difference,*
by which some of these passages may be
distinguished from others, and may be in-
terpreted *without* respect to the *cherubic*
faces. I shall make no scruple of appeal-
ing to the judgment of the reader, in re-
gard to the passage in hand, whether
there are not sufficient marks of diffe-
rence to distinguish it from ordinary ap-
pearances

pearances before the divine Presence in the Sanctuary; and whether therefore *before the Lord*, in the sense of *coram*, in *conspēctu*, &c. be not a more eligible version, than *after the faces*, or *before*, or *against the faces of Jehovah*.

THE next text cited is, *Gen. xvii. 1.* Where God says to *Abraham*, "Walk *before me* לפני and be thou perfect." *Interl. Vers.* Ambula in conspectu meo. But Mr H. "Walk *before me*, i. e. act the "part of a Priest to, or before these faces." *Glor. and Grav. p. 146.*

BUT I conceive, there are two objections against this construction. 1. That הלך is not used in this sense, though Priests and Prophets are frequently said to *stand* before the Lord, as expressive of their ministry and appointment to his service, so also are the *Levites*. And then the word is עמד, as in *Deut. x. 8.* "to *stand* before the Lord to minister," לעמד לפני יהוה לשרתו, see *2 Chron. xxix. 11. Ezek. xlv. 11, 15, &c.* "The Priests "could not *stand* to minister because of "the cloud." *1 Kings viii. 11.—2 Chron. v. 14. Elijah* the Prophet, "As the Lord *liveth before whom I stand.*" *1 Kings xvii.*

224 DISCOURSE II.

xvii. 1. and xviii. 15. *Elisha* the same, 2 *Kings* iii. 14. and v. 16. Yet it will hardly be thought, of these two, that their *standing לפני* was their standing before, the *cherubic faces*.

AND 2. That in the sense in which הלך is used with לפני, it doth not appear to have any sort of connexion either *with the part of a Priest*, or *with these faces*. As in the promise to *David* pleaded by *Solomon*, in his prayer, 1 *Kings* viii. 25. "There shall not fail thee a man in my fight לפני to sit on the throne of *Israel*; "so that thy children take heed to their way, that they walk before me, as thou hast walked before me," הלכת לפני לפני See also 2 *Chron.* vi. 16. and vii. 17. And none will suppose that the continuance of *David's* line, was promised under the condition of his children acting the *part of Priests* before the *Cherubim*.

UPON the two next texts cited by Mr *H.* viz. *Gen.* xvii. 18. and xxv. 22. *Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 146. He makes no remarks, by way of explanation or reference to the *Cherubim*, and so I shall pass them over here.

BUT

BUT of the next passage, viz. Gen. xxvii. 7. cited *ibid.* he gives a new translation. And instead of *before the Lord*, as in our version, he renders it *with respect to the faces of Jehovah*.

ISAAC had said to Esau "Bring me venison, and make me savoury meat that I may eat, and bless thee *before the Lord, before my death.*" The Hebrew is יְהוָה לִפְנֵי מוֹתִי which Montanus has rendered *Interl. Vers. Ad facies Domini, ad facies mortis meæ.* And so Mr H. had he quoted the remainder of the verse, must necessarily have proceeded,—*and with respect to the faces of Death*: or else have given up his construction of לִפְנֵי; and allowed it might sometimes signify *before*, and have no relation to visages. Why may it not in it's application to *Jehovah* signify *coram, in conspectu*, as above explained? and be put to shew, as Bishop Patrick notes, "that it was not a common blessing, but a solemn benediction, and by divine Authority and Approbation?" And why may it not have another use in it's application to *Isaac's* death, and signify simply *before*, with

Q

respect

226 DISCOURSE II.

respect to time, and without any respect to faces?

I SHALL only add one or two remarks more, on the use that is made of פָּנִי in order to establish *Cherubim* in the Patriarchal State, and so conclude this article.

Prel. Disc. to Elibu, p. 6. "The names of these places, so set apart for Divine Service, speak the same thing as was intended by their being given them at the time of their dedication. *Beth-EL* is the house of God—*Peni-EL* the faces of God, so called, I think, from the cherubic faces placed therein."

At *Peni-EL* the faces of God, there is a reference in the margin to *Psal. lxxxii. 5. This he ordained in Joseph for a testimony, &c.* which shall be considered in its place under עֲדוּת, where, perhaps, it will be found to have no more relation to *Peniel*, than it appears to have here in our English translation.

THE enquiry at present is, how this place comes to be called פְּנֵי־אֵל. And, I conceive, there is a satisfactory account given of it in *Gen. xxxii. 30.* "And Jacob called the name of the place פְּנֵי־אֵל, for I have seen God [אֱלֹהִים] face to face,"

“face,” [Heb. פנים אל פנים.] “and
“my life is preserved.”

HERE are two things deserving notice. The first is, that although *Jacob* saw *Elohim*, face to face, yet he called the name of the place *Peni-EL*. By which it should seem as if *Elohim* and *El* were in *Jacob's* construction of the same import, and that he did not understand, or use them here in Mr *H's* sense of the words, or give a name to the place from the *irradiator*, for this reason, because he had there seen the *fæderatores*.

THE other thing to be noticed is, that as one of the two *penim* (in *penim al penim*) must relate to *Jacob*, and consequently be understood singular, or of one visage; the other, which relates to *Elohim*, may be understood in the singular too, for any thing that can be objected to the contrary, from the plural termination of *penim*.

AND if אל, *El*, do constantly denote the second Person, the *irradiator*, as I think is often asserted in *Elibu*, and particularly, p. 34, 35. then the *peni* spoken of *El* ought to be singular in sense, as when it is spoken of any other single person.

228 DISCOURSE II.

FROM whence it plainly follows, that this place was not called *Peni-El* from the *cherubic faces* placed therein. The original imposition of it's name was from a vision of *Elohim*, in which vision the cherubic faces, as far as appears, bore no part. It was the appearance of אִישׁ, a person in human shape, that struggled with *Jacob*, and conversed with him face to face: which may well be supposed to be the second Person, as many have understood it: but leaves no room for saying, that *peni* means *cherubic faces*. These are the difficulties which I conceive attend this new construction of *Peniel*. But as it is offered with proper deference, and only *as an opinion*, I intend no censure on the writer, in these short remarks upon it, but submit both it and them, to the reader, and to the further examination of the learned.

THE other remark, with which I propose to conclude this article of פְּנִים, is upon that passage where מַפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים first occurs in Scripture: for Mr *H.* was apt to lay some stress upon the meaning of any word or phrase the first time it is used. Now this expression is met with

*

Gen.

upon CHERUBIM. 229

Gen. iii. 8. where *Adam* and *Eve* are said to have hid themselves from the Presence of the Lord God, among the trees in the garden. Mr *H.* renders it, “ they hid, “ covered themselves from the faces of “ *Jehovah* in the middle of the garden.” *Use of Reas.* Vol. I. p. 110. Whether or no he designed by this version to suggest, that there was an image of *Rubbin* (to speak his language) in Paradise, with emblematical visages, before the expulsion of *Adam* and *Eve*, I must not say; because I do not find that he hath any where delivered his sentiment plainly on this head. He speaks, indeed, of a precedent of the *Cherubim*. (*Introd. to Mos. sine Princ.* p. 280.) “ And he expelled the “ man and שכן inhabited מקדם from “ the precedent *,” (this word is rendered in our Bibles at the East †) “ at the garden of *Eden* — את־הכרובים the *Cherubim*.” Gen. iii. 24.

Q 3

IN

* Mr *Holloway* says, “ the given root is קדם to prevent, to be first in time, place, lineal order, &c. In “ place to the site of the *Cherubic Throne*.” *Orig.* Vol. II. p. 56.

† “ God planted it מקדם from that East or principal part, as respecting him, of whose names one was אצל,

“ אצל,

230 DISCOURSE II.

In his *Remarks*. p. 362. he says " that
 " the next action after ejecting the man,
 " was to inhabit **מקדש** from the precedent
 " to the Garden of Eden **אדן** the *substance*
 " of the *Cherubim*."

In page 371. he says " that the apostate
 " Jews universally agree, as much as they
 " do in any point, that the exhibition of
 " the *Cherubim* which they call *Thronum*
 " *Majestatis*, *Thronum Gloriæ Divinæ*,
 " &c.* so the *Sanctuarium* for it and
 " them were created before this world
 " (some say 2000 years before) and 'tis
 " expressed that those at Paradise were
 " **מקדש** from *that precedent*."

AND in *Heb. Writ. perf.* he expresses
 the matter thus. " And *Jehovah Aleim*
 " sent

" **יולד**, the east, the day spring from whom were to arise
 " and spring to us all those great and gracious things above
 " referred to and explained." *Orig. Vol. I. p. 111.*

" THE Divine presence we are to remember was
 " exhibited with the other high symbols in the *Cherubic*
 " manifestation placed **לפני עדין** **מקדש** over *the east* or
 " principal part of the Garden of *Eden*, i. e. from the part
 " where the person and acts of Christ were eminently
 " represented."—I leave to others to reconcile them,
 or chuse between them.

* MR *Moody* is with Mr *H*— in this matter; and
 says " from the *first exhibition* the *precedent* in Heaven."
 p. 81.

upon *CHERUBIM*. 231

“ sent him forth, and גֵּרָשׁ removed to the
 “ outside (the suburbs) the substance of
 “ the man. And he (*Jehovah Aleim*
 “ will inhabit (then inhabited) מִקְדָּם
 “ from the first place (from the throne
 “ in Heaven, or if it was exhibited in *Eden*
 “ from thence) at the garden of *Eden* the
 “ *Cherubim*.” * p. 356.

HERE is a very indistinct account of something which he often repeats and inculcates, formed upon a construction of מִקְדָּם which is unsupported; and I conceive cannot be supported by any parallel instance in Scripture. But two things are obvious enough from it.

FIRST, that if *Gen.* iii. 24. where the *Cherubim* are first mentioned (and the only text where they are mentioned in the Pentateuch till the account of the golden *Cherubim* is given) is not to be rightly understood without a reference to the doctrine of the *Rabbins* concerning *Thro-*

Q 4 *num*

* THE note added in the margin to explain this (that I may not conceal any light given to the passage) is this.—“ Removed the *Cherubim* from the first place
 “ they were exhibited at, and dwelt in them at the Gar-
 “ den of *Eden*, into which they seem placed as the entrance.
 “ And so *Adam* could not go into the garden, but by these
 “ figures, viz. not into Heaven, but by what was here
 “ represented.” Note in p. 356. of *Hab. Writ. perf.*

232 DISCOURSE II.

num Majestatis before the world (as we have before seen, that the word *Cherubim* could not be rightly made out in Mr *H.*'s way, without the help of a *Rabbinical* tradition, *Heb. Writ. perf.* p. 241, and 305.) it must further increase the suspicion that Mr *H.*'s whole construction of the *Cherubim* is precarious, and not founded on those clear and plain proofs that he pretended to have established it upon.

AND secondly, that Mr *H.* doth not take upon him to say that there was a precedent of the *Cherubim* in the garden before man's expulsion. He further expresses his doubt about this *Introd. Mos. sine Princ.* p. 180. From whence I infer that פני יהוה *Gen.* iii. 8. from which our first parents hid themselves, doth not, even in his account, necessarily imply emblematical faces or visages for the expressing of God's presence: and consequently that no stress should be laid on the same expression when used of God in other places, as if it denoted a sensible exhibition of the *Cherubic* faces. And that therefore our Translators are not to be censured for rendering פני under it's several prefixes in the manner they have done.

THERE

upon CHERUBIM. 233

THERE is a critical discussion of this same text in *Elibu*, from p. 26, to 35. in which although there is a very particular account given of some words, as חבא and הח"ם to shew "*the probability of the first unhappy pair flying for refuge to the tree of the living ones, the symbol of the Elahim,*" yet no distinct account is offered of this other phrase יהוה מפני used on the same occasion.

THE Cherubic faces are represented, in this Treatise, as *a new symbol* set up for man's comfort as well as direction upon his banishment out of Paradise; p. 35. The tree of *the living ones* in Paradise being, as the author humbly thinks, the first symbol, given during the state of innocence, and equally representative of the three persons in the Deity, p. 40. *Prel. Disc.* But מפני, if to be understood of visages, Gen. iii. 8. can neither be applied, in that sense, to the symbolical tree, which had no visages, nor to the Cherubic faces which were not as yet set up: and therefore it must denote the *Presence* which the criminal pair fled from, to have been otherwise perceived by them than in exhibition of visages. And accordingly

234 DISCOURSE II.

ingly our English version of this text, *in respect of this phrase*, stands allowed in p. 26, 27. though one might reasonably have expected Mr H—n's version by *the faces of Jehovah* (*Use of Reas.* Vol. I. p. 110.) would have been preferred, had not this author been sensible that the phrase related to a *presence* of God, which did neither include visible faces, nor was included in the general idea of God's ubiquity. Nay Mr H. himself, when he treated more professedly on this text in his *Introd. to Mos. sine Princ.* p. 180. says "many have attempted to guess at what appearance God put on. He says nothing here but that they heard a voice, if it were that voice which had declared the forming of *Eve* it was sufficient." Which is as much I think as any one can justly say upon the matter, and deserves to be considered by all his followers who insist so strongly on the version of *the faces of Jehovah*, wherever the same expression occurs in the original.

I PROCEED now to some other texts that have been produced for the proof of the *Cberubic* faces in the patriarchal times. Mr H. has made no remark himself on

Gen.

Gen. xxv. 22. He barely quotes it among his texts cited for this purpose, *Glor.* and *Grav.* p. 146. But we are fully instructed in the inferences that may be drawn from it in support of his opinion, in p. 36. of *Elibu*.

GEN. XXV. 22.

“AND she (*Rebekah*) went to enquire
“of the Lord.”——

“AND where can it be supposed *Rebekah* went, but to some particular place,
“some house of God where the sacred
“emblems were placed, from whence
“answers were given to such as came
“properly to ask counsel.—It is not said
“that *Rebekah* went to enquire of any
“prophet or priest, but of the Lord the
“very *Jehovah*. *We are obliged*, I think,
“to suppose that she went to that *symbolical presence* of the Deity which was
“called *the faces of Jehovah*, from whence
“God vouchsafed to answer and direct
“his faithful people whenever they duly
“called upon him.”

WITH all submission I apprehend we cannot *be obliged* to suppose this, unless it were first shewn, that *Jehovah*, and very *Jehovah*, mean the *faces of Jehovah*, and his

236 DISCOURSE II.

his faces mean the *Cherubim*, and that he could not be otherwise applied to but through them, and could not or would not reveal his mind to men any other way then by responses from thence.

THEODORET in his *Questions upon Genesis* (which book of his is appealed to in *Elibu*, at *p.* 40. upon another occasion, as we observed before) on the 76th question, Διατινος ηβελησεν η Ρεβεκκα κ.τ.λ. answers, "Some says she went to *Melchisedeck* the Priest of the High God, a person illustrious for his piety. But as the Patriarchs were wont to build altars in the places where they dwelt, it is likely she went to make her supplications, at one of these, to the Lord of all things; and to have learnt what should befall her." *Theod.* Vol. I. *p.* 104. And I think the interpreters follow one or other of these expositions. The first of which will not seem out of the way, when we remember that the same words in the original, that we translate *went to enquire* of the Lord ותלך לדרש are used, 1 *Sam.* ix. 9. "Before time in *Israel* when a man *went to enquire* of God (*Heb.* בלכתו לדרוש אלהים) thus he speaks, "Come

“Come let us go to the *Seer*,” &c. Yet in my judgment the other is to be preferred, viz. that she went to the stated place of public worship, where, at least occasionally, God gave some sensible manifestation of his presence, and resolved, in some supernatural way, the enquiries that were properly made by the faithful. But this does not oblige us to suppose a symbolical presence by *Cberubic faces* as described by *Ezekiel*.

To pass on to another text produced in support of *Cberubim* during the patriarchal state. *Psal.* lxxxi. 5. is referred to in the margin of p. 6. *Prel. Disc.* at the words *Peniel, the faces of God*: and again at p. 41. of *Elibu*, where the inference made from it is, that “these sacred emblems were with the *Israelites* in *Egypt*.”

THE proof lies in the marginal note, in these words.

“OUR translation runs, *this be ordained in Joseph for a testimony, when he went out through the land of Egypt.* The word rendered *testimony* is YEDVTH plural, and the word *for* should be placed before *Joseph*, and omitted where it is. The testimony or YEDVTH was
“ or

238 DISCOURSE. II.

“ or were ordained, placed, or constituted
 “ for the sake of *Joseph*, or those people
 “ who were described under that name.”

HERE it is taken for granted, (and the force of the remark rests intirely on that presumption) that YeDVTH (עדות) is the plural of עדת testimony: whereas there is a noun singular עדת feminine, and of the same signification, (as appears from *Psal.* xix. 18. עדת יהוה נאמנה, and other places) though in termination like עדת *similitudo*, or like מלכות *regnum* which makes its plural מלכות. And this עדת singular is a noun of pretty common occurrence in the *Pentateuch*, as will appear hereafter, and is sometimes wrote without the *Vau* עדת. And that it cannot be understood in this passage otherwise than as a noun singular, appears from the context, in which the verb שמו he *made*, he *ordained* it, relates to הוא in the preceding verse; as interpreters observe.—Blow up the trumpet in the New Moon, &c. For (הוא) *this* (viz. *clangere tubis*) was a statute (חוק) for *Israel*, and a law (משפט) of the God of *Jacob*. He ordained it (שמו) in or for *Joseph* (עדות) *a testimony*, or memorial.

BUT

upon CHERUBIM. 239

BUT if it were allowed that עֲרֻמִּים here is plural and signifies *witnesses* (nor *testimony*), yet it must signify female *witnesses*; whereas this same author had told us in a note at p. 22. that עָרִי (the plural masc. of עָרָא *testis*) was the word by which these witnesses were termed in *Exek. vii. 20.* And it would likewise in this plural construction be incapable of the sense our author would give to the passage: for the verb יָצְאוּ must then be taken for the third person plural and would be *active*, and signify *they ordained*, and not *they were ordained*.

THEY who can conclude from hence, that God set up the *Cherubim* among the Hebrews in *Egypt*, may not be blamed for making the best of their conclusion; but every one who considers the place will judge for himself.

THE last proof I have to examine under this head is *Exodus xvi. 34.* A text on which the author of *Elibu*, lays a very remarkable stress. In his *Prel. Disc.* he says p. 44. "that these figures (*viz. Cherubim*) were what was called the *testimony* or *witnesses*, *Exod. xvi. 34.* is very probable. Before the tabernacle
" was

240 DISCOURSE II.

“ was made, *Aaron* was ordered to take a
 “ pot and put an omer full of manna therein,
 “ and lay it up before the Lord (or to the
 “ faces of *Jehovah*). Then follows im-
 “ mediately in the next verse, *As the*
 “ Lord commanded *Moses*, so *Aaron* laid it
 “ up before the testimony, or to the faces of
 “ the witnesses.—The Holy Ghost there-
 “ by plainly teaching us, that before the
 “ Lord, and before the testimony, are the
 “ same thing.”

IN *Elibu*, p. 37. he says, “ the fact of
 “ there being *Cberubim* faces in the pa-
 “ triarchal state is, I think, undeniably
 “ confirmed from *Exod. xvi. 34.* where
 “ it is said, that the manna was to be laid
 “ up or placed to or before the faces of
 “ the witnesses, as the literal translation
 “ is,—according to the English translation
 “ before the testimony.—What is called
 “ here before the testimony, is in the 33d
 “ verse before the Lord. If this be not a
 “ proof that the Divine Presence was by
 “ these witnesses, and this symbolical represen-
 “ tation suggested and attested, and that
 “ these sacred emblems then attended the
 “ Church of God, I know not what can be
 “ called evidence.”

THESE

upon **CHERUBIM.** 241

THESE last words from a person of the author's character, do almost forbid me to declare myself of another opinion. And yet after a repeated review of what he infers from this passage, I cannot discover the justness of his inferences.

FOR in the first place, although the command *to lay up the pot of manna before the Lord* given by *Moses*, and the execution of it by *Aaron*, are both of them recorded in this chapter among other particulars concerning *manna*, which were prior in time to the ark or the tabernacle; yet this seems to be done (as Bishop *Patrick* observes upon the place) only because they belonged to the same matter which the Sacred Historian was treating of in this chapter. Of this we have another instance in the words that immediately follow the passage under consideration, viz. ver. 35. *And the Children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited. They did eat manna until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan.* This was either wrote by way of anticipation or *Prolepsis*, or was added at last by *Moses* to the other particulars relating to *manna*,

R

that

242 DISCOURSE II.

that all which belonged to this matter might appear together in one place. And whatever serves for a solution of this 35th verse, will serve also to explain the two foregoing, viz. the 33d, and 34th, about the pot of *manna*, ordered to be laid up before the Lord by *Moses*, and laid up before the Testimony by *Aaron*.

AND hereby *Buxtorf* will be discharged of that *blunder* Mr *H.* charges him with, *Heb. Writ. perf.* p. 419. in citing *Exod.* xvi. 33. “ לפני הצדָה and לפני יהוה ” “ when the ark was not made, nor the “ tables written.” And the opinion also of our present author, “ that the fact “ of there being *cherubic* faces in the Patriarchal State, is hereby *undeniably* confirmed,” will lose much of it's weight.

IN the next place, whereas it is said, that “ the Holy Ghost plainly teaches us, “ that *before the Lord* and *before the Testimony*, are the same thing ;” *Prel. Disc.* p. 44. it may be answered, that there is a sense in which this is true, and there is a sense in which it is not so. It is true with respect to the ark, when it was set up, and with respect to God's visible Presence

fence upon it. And this truth Bishop Patrick acknowledges, giving this reason; for, says he, *the Divine Glory dwelt between the Cherubims which were over the ark.* So that what was done *before* the ark, *εναυλιον τε μαρτυριου*, as the LXX have expressed it, was done also *before* the Lord, *εναυλιον τε Θεου*. And so our author acknowledges in the foregoing page (*Prel. Disc.* p. 43.) “Before this Ark, and *so* before “the Cherubim, the annual atonement was “to be made.”

BUT then there is another sense in which it is not true, that the Holy Ghost plainly teaches that *before the Lord*, and *before the Testimony* are the same thing. The Holy Ghost teaches us nothing plainly about the faces of the Lord, or the faces of *the Witnesses*. Neither doth it teach us that the Lord and the Witnesses are one and the same object. These are only Mr H.’s presumptions, who is pleased to say, but *has no where* proved, “that “the faces of Jehovah, and the faces of “העדה are synonymous: and that the “Cherubim and the Presence in them was “העדה.” *Use of Reas.* p. 212.

244 DISCOURSE II.

AND in the third place, I observe, that our author can allow העדות to signify the *Testimony*, as a noun singular, in *Exod.* xxv. 16. though he insists upon it's being understood in the text under consideration, as plural, and interpreted of *the Witnesses*.

HIS words upon *Exod.* xxv. 16. are these. “*And thou shalt put into the ark, the Testimony, which I shall give thee.*” “So that as there was no written Law or Testimony before, there was no such use for an ark. And this agrees with St Paul's account, that within the ark were the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod, and the *Tables of the Covenant*.”

NOW if העדות may signify the *Law*, or *Testimony* in this text, why must it be interpreted of *Witnesses*, or the *Cherubim* in another text, viz. *Exod.* xvi. 34.? There is no reason, I think, to be alledged for it, unless it be this, that the Law or Testimony was not given, nor the ark made for it's repository, 'till after the times to which *Exod.* xvith relates. But this reason is already precluded by my first observation.

AND

upon **CHERUBIM.** 245

AND I now leave it with my reader to judge, whether our author was not a little too partial to Mr *H.*'s hypothesis, and to his own way of supporting it, when he said, that if what he had offered *was not proof, he knew not what could be called evidence,*

R 3 S E C T.

246 DISCOURSE II.

S E C T. IV.

Examination of Texts relating to the Cherubim in the Tabernacle and Temple.

WE are now come to the consideration of *the solid representations*, (as Mr C. calls them, *p. 15.*) of *these similitudes*, viz. of the great Ones, in the *Tabernacle and Temple*.

HE says, "The two figures stood one
"over against the other, and the faces
"were turned toward each other, in the
"posture of persons entering into a co-
"venant, and they also all looked down-
"ward on the Mercy-Seat, and beheld
"the blood sprinkled there by the High
"Priest, as the true *Rubim*, the great
"Ones in the highest Heavens turn their
"eyes on the meritorious Sacrifice of
"Christ's crucified Body and Blood pour-
"ed out." *Serm. p. 14.*

WHICH

upon CHERUBIM. 247

WHICH description in words, answers to the draught of the said similitudes given as a frontispiece to several volumes of Mr H.'s works, under the title of *The Christian Covenant in Hieroglyphics*.

BUT the first point I shall speak to, being, as I apprehend, the leading question in this part of the argument is, whether *any solid representation* set up by God's order, may be supposed to be a *similitude of Himself*? for however it might have pleased him in revealing himself to his Prophets in visions, or dreams, to convey ideas of his attributes or designs by animal forms, or other corporeal figures, or appearances; yet that he should allow himself, or (as in this case) command himself to be represented by material images formed by human hands, and these as standing and perpetual emblems of his mysterious Triune Nature, or, in Mr H.'s phrase, images of the Divine Persons in Covenant, is something seemingly so repugnant to his written will in the most obvious interpretations of it, as should not be admitted without the clearest, most express, and indubitable evidence.

248 DISCOURSE II.

DEUT. iv. 15. "Take good heed
 "unto your selves, for ye saw no manner
 "of similitude on the day that the Lord
 "spake unto you in *Horeb*, out of the
 "midst of the fire, lest ye corrupt your
 "selves, and make you a graven image,
 "the similitude of any figure, the like-
 "ness of male or female, the likeness of
 "any beast that is on the earth, the like-
 "ness of any winged fowl that flieth in
 "the air."

Now one remarkable conclusion to be drawn, as Dr *Warburton* justly observes, from the reason of this exhortation is, that "*Moses's* prime intention was, to warn the people against representing the God of *Israel* under the shape of men or animals, in the manner that the *Egyptians* worshipped their greater gods." *Div. Leg.* Vol. II. p. 170.

MR *H.* thought it a sufficient answer to any thing that might be objected to him from the text abovementioned — that God might order *that* to be done by a special command of his own, which nevertheless he most strictly forbid the people to do, without a special command. True; but this answer reaches only to *the fact*

fact prohibited, and not to *the reason* which is given for the prohibition. His right to do many things which he forbids others to do is not denied. But when at any time such a special reason is given for his prohibition of others, as his own act, were he to do himself what he forbids others to do, would evacuate and destroy, in such a case, I say, he cannot be supposed to contravene the reason of his prohibition.

AND this is the case under consideration, God gave a visible exhibition of his presence and majesty at *Horeb*. But in such a manner as to give no idea of a similitude of himself that might afterwards be represented by art, sculpture, or imagery. Consequently no similitude at *Horeb* by ox, lion, eagle, or any other conceivable permanent shape. *Moses* gives this as the reason why the people should not presume to represent him by any material figure or form. When therefore God immediately after commanded *Moses* to form two figures in gold to be placed at the ends of the ark, it can scarce be believed that he would thereby counteract his own proceeding at *Horeb*, by appoint-

250 DISCOURSE II.

appointing them to represent *the Aleim*, and under a name too that signified *the image or similitude of the great ones*, and thereby furnish the people with an authentick pattern of *a similitude of himself*, which was the very thing he had just before so carefully prevented their gaining, by purposely avoiding in the manifestation of his immediate presence, whatever might lead or tempt them to form such gross conceptions of him.

MR H. indeed cites a text in *Hosea*, viz. xii. 10. which if understood of the *Che-
rubic*, to which he applies it, will countenance his hypothesis of their being given as a similitude of God himself. *Glor. and Grav.* p. 185.

“ I HAVE also spoken by the prophets,
“ I have multiplied visions, and by the
“ ministry (hand) of the prophets אֲדָמָה
“ have given *a similitude*.”

THUS he is pleased to render it in allusion to the pattern given by God to *Moses*, *David*, &c. of the *Che-
rubic* forms, which were to keep the people steady, and that they might not devise to themselves other similitudes.

BUT

upon CHERUBIM. 251

BUT of all the senses that are put upon אֲדָמָה in this text (of which there are several collected by Dr *Pocock* in his critical note on the place, to whom I refer for satisfaction) there are none which appear so distant from the scope of the context, as this of Mr *H.*'s. And as he says nothing to support it, I think, I need not enlarge upon it.

AND this argument drawn from the reason given by *Moses* of *no similitude in Horeb*, holds equally good, in my apprehension, against any similitude of God having been exhibited by himself at any time before, as a standing emblem of his nature, or as a representation of the Divine Persons in Covenant. Which I take notice of here, to obviate the supposition of the *Cherubim* being the known pictures or images of the Deity from the beginning: since this is urged by some as a good account how *Moses* and the workmen came to be so well acquainted with the *Cherubic* form, as they seem to have been, when the order for setting up the golden *Cherubim* was given. This is urged by a very ingenious writer who is of opinion, that " this representation in the *Cherubim* was

252 DISCOURSE II.

“was a thing so well known, and under-
 “stood by the Ancients, though we have
 “have no description of it but in *Ezekiel’s*
 “vision, that when the Lord command-
 “ed it to be made for the *Sanctum San-*
 “*ctorum*, the workmen made it at once
 “without wanting a pattern.” *Letter to*
*a Bishop, p. 40.**

AND in another place, after having
 mentioned the various compositions of
 animal forms in the idols of the Gentiles,
 he says, “we must recollect, that though
 “the building of the tabernacle was not
 “so early, as to give birth to those strange
 “compositions over the heathen world;
 “yet *this figure* was exhibited immedi-
 “ately upon the expulsion of man from
 “Paradise, and was so well known when
 “*Israel* left *Egypt*, that the workmen
 “made the *Cherubim* without any other
 “direction, than that of making them
 “out

* ONE must suppose that Moses was no stranger to the
 form of them, but a few directions were given with regard
 to the position of their wings and faces, which might be
 probably necessary upon the addition of other types in the
 furniture of the Tabernacle. And the veil is ordered to
 be made with *Cherubim* as figures sufficiently known with-
 out any particular instruction. *Prel. Disc. to Elisha,*
p. 44.

“out of the gold that composed the
“Mercy-Seat.” *Thoughts concerning Re-
ligion*, p. 190.

MOSES, it is acknowledged, did not explain either *the name* or *the design* of the *Cherubim* which he set upon the ark, nor is he explicit as to the figure of them. This may appear to us, in these days, an omission not easy to be accounted for. But it will not warrant, I conceive, these conjectures that are made about it.—As, that the artists were previously so well acquainted with the form of the *Cherubim*, that *they made them at once without having a pattern*. Whereas it should rather be concluded from the Scripture account, short as it is, that *Moses* himself knew not the form of them, ’till he had been instructed in it by the *pattern in the mount*. For though when God said to him, *Exod.* xxv. 19. *Thou shalt make two Cherubims of gold*, there is room left to suppose he might know the fashion in which they were to be made: yet we read at the 40th verse, *Look that thou make them after their pattern*; and that this direction extended farther than the things immediately mentioned before, we may conclude with probability

254 DISCOURSE. II.

probability from the extensiveness of the plan which *David* gave *Solomon*, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 11. in which the chariot of the *Cberubim* was comprehended ver. 40. But the manner in which *St Paul* quotes this text of *Moses*, viz. *See that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount*, gives us abundant reason to think that the particular form of the *Cberubim* in every respect, was directed, and that *Moses* was not, much less were the workmen, left to his, or their own notions of the figure. That he hath not recorded every particular that he might have given them in direction, is but a slender proof that they stood in need of none other on this occasion save those which are recorded. But it is no slender objection to the supposition of his ordering, or their making any graven images representing the Deity, that he enforced a solemn charge against this very thing, by reminding the people that *they had seen no similitude in the day that the Lord spake unto them*: this had seemed an argument of little weight or consequence, if there had been from the first a *visible similitude of the great Ones*, given originally

ginally to *Adam* by God himself, and continued among the Patriarchs in every generation, so as to be commonly known by the *Hebrews* when they left *Egypt*.

BUT it seems, it is thought, that unless we admit this, it will be difficult to account for those strange compositions of animal bodies among the ancient idols. They are supposed to owe their birth to something more ancient than the Tabernacle; one might put a query upon that; but allowing they did, will not human invention, when once it became exercised in hieroglyphicks account for all? or will it not be equally hard to find the reason that should induce God to set up the *solid Cherubim* in the Tabernacle, as a revival or republication of *those similitudes*, which had been already the means of corrupting mankind, by tempting them to form the like by their own workmanship, and in their own taste?

IT cannot be denied that Mr *H.*'s account of the origin of idolatry, and of the heathen hieroglyphics, especially those in which the bull, lion, or eagle are concerned, runs smoothly enough, after his foundation is pre-supposed: and the exit
of

256 DISCOURSE II.

of his hypothesis on this article, is plausible while the first scene of it stands allowed. Admit the first and most early exhibitions of the *great Ones* after the fall of man, to be what he describes, and the consequence will be natural and probable, that men would by degrees corrupt the revelations and traditions concerning them, and misapply the emblems. But the more natural and probable this consequence appears, the less forward should we be, without satisfactory proof, to believe that there was so early and so obvious an handle given for the introduction of the worship of human and animal forms. The reason of *no similitude in Horeb* subsisted from the beginning, and forbids, I apprehend, without good proof first produced to the contrary, our interpreting any supernatural exhibitions of animal forms, as pictures or images of the Godhead, as much as it forbids our putting that construction upon any solid image-work, tho' made by God's own appointment.

If it be said, as I think it is, by the author of *Thoughts conc. Religion*, p. 82. and *Letter to a Bishop*, p. 30. that upon Mr H.'s plan, the *Cherubim* were not intended

tended as representations or similitudes of the Divine Persons, but only as emblems denoting the prime Agents in Nature, or the Trinity in the Heavens, by the principal animals on earth; and more remotely, and as it were, by consequence only, denoting the formers of these material Agents, or the invisible Trinity, of whom those Agents, or Heavens, are the most proper representatives; the objection will appear to be something *farther removed*, but still it will not be *avoided*. For the temptations to mankind to corrupt themselves with image-worship, would be much the same under this view as under the former.

FOR the bulk of mankind in their frail and lapsed state would scarce be able to retain these distinctions, in this double folding of emblematical representation, however well they might have been explained to them at first by revelation; but would be apt to mistake the original intention of the hieroglyphic, and confound the emblems with the things they represented.

WHAT the same author observes in his *Thoughts conc. Religion*, p. 71. 4to edition.

S

viz,

258 DISCOURSE II.

viz. that “ the making of molten and
 “ graven images to be worshipped and
 “ served as gods, was probably a notorious
 “ abuse, through the wantonness of ima-
 “ gination of *some laudable sacred institu-*
 “ *tion*;—and that we may reasonably
 “ conclude, that representations which
 “ *naturally*, and without some institution,
 “ *would never have come into the heads of*
 “ *any men*, flowed from an early practice
 “ that had a different intent from that to
 “ which it was at last turned,” (*ibid.* p. 75.)
 —is, I think, justly observed. But when
 he says further, p. 71. “ that it may be
 “ pretty securely concluded that, great as
 “ the abuse was, *it was not altogether bu-*
 “ *man invention* ;” and again, at page 75.
 “ From the original exhibition of the *Che-*
 “ *rubim*, renewed and recalled to it’s pro-
 “ per use in the tabernacle and temple, *we*
 “ *see the ancients had a pattern* from whence
 “ they might have taken those representa-
 “ tions which they monstruously abused.”
 He seems to take more into his conclu-
 sion than these premises will warrant, and
 carry the point further than will be al-
 lowed.

FOR

FOR it doth not follow that *the laudable institution*, which they so grossly abused, must therefore have been of God's appointment; since an hieroglyphic, *altogether of human invention*, would be as capable of misinterpretation and misapplication as one that was *Divine*. Neither doth it follow, that *the institution* which they perverted into *idol-worship*, gave originally *any representations of the Deity*: for what was instituted only to preserve the memory of heroes of distinguished and illustrious characters, might be, in the progress of time and error, construed as symbolic of the Divine Being and Attributes, and so terminate at length in idol-worship. And one would rather choose to suppose, that the monstrous brood of deified animal forms, were begot by *the wanton imaginations of some men, upon the sage inventions of others*, than that they took their birth from the *Cherubim*; or, that God himself was the first setter up of those figures, which, under a name importing *the similitudes* of himself, proved the occasion of putting men upon what otherwise could never have come into their heads.

260 DISCOURSE II.

To return now to the particular consideration of the *Cherubim* in the Tabernacle.

“THE Prophet,” (says the same author, *Thoughts concerning Religion*, p. 109.) “takes so much care to inculcate, that the “creatures or figures thus represented “were the *Cherubim*, and that the description in the first and tenth chapters “relates to the same *Cherubim*, that there “can be no doubt, he describes the very “*Cherubim* placed in the Tabernacle and “Temple, unless it can be supposed that “this description was given on set purpose “to deceive and mislead us.”

I TAKE for granted this worthy Gentleman, in these words, had his eye only on the figures on the Mercy-Seat; yet if he had been asked, which of the *Cherubim* placed in the Tabernacle and Temple it was that he meant, whether those made by *Moses* for the Ark, or those set up by *Solomon* in the Holy Place, or those that were wrought and interwove in the curtains, and the veil of the Tabernacle, (*Exod.* xxvi. 1, and 31.) or those that we read of, wrought on the bases and intermixed with lyons and oxen, or on the borders
of

of the bases among the lyons and palm-trees, (1 Kings vii. 29, and 36.) in all which places the same word used by *Ezekiel* is also used; I say, had he been asked, whether he extended his observation to all these *Cherubim* indifferently, I am apt to think, that before he answered the question, he would have discovered room for doubt, whether the *same* form was punctually kept to in all these divers pieces of imagery and workmanship; or whether we are bound to conceive, from the mere usage of the same word, that *Ezekiel's* description related to them all; at least *so obliged* to conceive it, as to be in peril, should we think otherwise of charging the Prophet, in effect, with a design of misleading us by his description.

I SHALL endeavour to preserve all due reverence to the inspired Pen-man, and pay the utmost regard to what he has wrote, while I make a real doubt, at the same time, whether his description of the *Cherubim* corresponds with every thing that is called by that name in Holy Scripture. I have shewn above, from the different usage and application of *Cherub* by the Prophet himself, that the word doth

262 DISCOURSE II.

not always convey the same idea of external forms: by attending to which remark, made on his own writings, we are secure from being *deceived*, or *misled by him*, however we may, through inattention, *deceive* ourselves, and *mislead* one another.

IT has been urged as an argument, for the application of *Ezekiel's cherubic* forms to the golden *cherubs* on the Mercy-Seat, that this Prophet being a Priest, must have been well acquainted with the *cherubic* types in the first Temple: from which it is inferred, that he would not have known the figures in his visions to be *Cherubim*, if their form had not corresponded with the forms of those which he had seen in the temple.

THIS is not indeed, any peculiar notion of Mr H. other expositors have espoused it; and others again have opposed it. *The defender of Mr H.'s plan*, uses an argument for it which is uncommon, viz. that *Ezekiel* could not be ignorant of the form of the *Cherubim*; for, says he, p. 52. "Their faces might be seen in the Holy Place, or middle Temple, over the veil."

BUT

upon *CHERUBIM*. 263

BUT another very learned author is of a quite different opinion, and says, that
 “Neither the people, nor the king, nor
 “the priests, ever saw the *Cherubim* in the
 “*Sanctum Sanctorum*: only the High-
 “Priest entering once a year there where
 “they were, and with a cloud of incense
 “too about himself, as if he also should
 “not see them.” *Pocock on Hosea. Edit. Twelves. Vol. II. p. 137.*

BUT allowing that the Prophet did know the form of the *Cherubs* within the most holy Place, as well as of those which were described on the walls and sacred utensils of the Temple * without the veil; yet it doth not follow that he discovered the living creatures in his visions to be *Cherubim*, merely from their correspondence in form, with any of those Temple figures. He might know what they were by other information, or by reflexion, and an attentive consideration of them, on their appearance described in his ninth and tenth chapters; for *then* it was, and not

S 4 before,

* “Cum in multis templi exterioris partibus & vasibus
 “sacris expressi fuerint *Cherubini*, eorum formæ sacerdoti-
 “bus etiam ordinariis qualis erat *Ezechiel* imo & toti po-
 “pulo facile innotescere potuerunt.” *Spencer, p. 778.*

264 DISCOURSE II.

before, that he says he knew them to be *Cberubim* *. This was *Theodore*'s opinion †, and is espoused by *Deylingius* and *Witsius*, whose sentiments on this particular, as they are pretty delicate and worth knowing, I shall give in the margin, in their own words ‡.

ALLOWING further, that the Prophet discovered the living creatures to be *Cberubim*

* This seems to be given, chap. x. 20. as the reason why he had used *Cherub* and *Cberubim* in relating the vision described in these two chapters; which words he had not used before, though he had seen the same appearance at *Chebar*, chap. i. and again, viii. 4.

† Της μὲν γὰρ θεωρίας καὶ ἡδε προσέειπεν ἀπελάυσα τὴν δὲ περὶ ἡγορίαν ἐπὶ τῇ παροῦσῃ μεμαδῆκα. *Theod.* in locum, Vol. II. p. 347.

‡ "Nemo certis argumentis affirmare aufit, Cherubos "Mosaicos arcæ impositos & in tabernaculo & templo depictos, eandem plane speciem habuisse cum Cherubis ab *Ezechiel* visis. Dubium auget quod *Cherubi* isti *Ezechiel*i apparuerunt ut formæ plane insolitæ, quia se demum cognovisse testatur quod quæ viderat animantia *Cherubini* essent, c. x. v. 20. *Witsius* in *Ægyptiacis*, lib. ii. c. xiii. suspicatur non de figura *Ezechielem* differuisse cum se *Cherubos* agnovisse narrat, sed de re per hieroglyphicum istud symbolum significatâ: quippe qui post aliquam demum meditationem deprehenderit mirabilia ista animantia cœlestium Angelorum emblemata esse, idemque per ea significari quod per sacros templi *Cherubos*. Non autem quæ ejusdem rei symbola sunt eâ quoque inter se exactâ similitudine convenire necesse est." *Deyling. Observ. sacr.* P. ii. p. 443.

rubim merely from the likeness he observed they had of the *Cberubs* in the Temple; yet will it not follow that their forms were altogether the same, but only that they were *alike* in some striking circumstance, and bore each of them some characterizing mark that would sufficiently shew what they were. This *Calvin* supposed to be the case, and that *Ezek.* recognized the *Cberubic* visage in the Temple, in the face of the ox only*, which occasioned his calling it the face of a *Cberub* in his second description Ch. x. ver. 14. as being the same visage that was given to the *Cberubic* types in the Temple.

THE application of פני כרוב and פני שור to one and the same supposed visage in the visions, has induced some to confine the proper *Cberubic* form to that of a calf or young steer; and others, even persons of

* "QUUM ergo facies bovis oblata fuisset prophetæ
 " prope fluvium *Chebar*, nunc ut intelligat esse angelos,
 " vel *Cherubim* animalia, neque quatuor capita ipsum ab-
 " strahant, ideo proponitur facies *Cherub*, ut illo indicio
 " admonitus statuatur unum quodque animalium nihil
 " aliud esse quam angelum vel *Cherub* tametsi differat a
 " receptâ formâ, cujus Deus proposuerat exemplar Mosis
 " in monte." — *Calv. in loc.*

266 DISCOURSE II.

of no small account in the literate world, to suppose that *Cberub* did properly signify an ox, and was deduced from a root that signifies to plow.*

THE use I would make of the different sentiments of other writers on this particular article now in hand, is only this, that the arguments used for the sameness of appearance in *Ezekiel's* and *Moses's Cherubim* are not conclusive: that there yet remains a doubt, whether the idea of their form may justly be transferred from the one to the other; and that it may remain still, without supposing the prophet's account was given on set purpose to mislead us.

BUT allowing further in the last place, that the *Cberubim* in the Tabernacle and Temple

* "PRO שור vultu bovis qui memoratur Ezech. I. 10. hic viz. X. 14. פני כרוב. Quæ collatio suspicionem injicit כרוב significare bovem a Chaldaico, Syriacoque כרב aravit. Boves enim arationi adhibebantur." *Lud. de Dieu Epist. ad Guil. Boswell, inter Medi opera, p. 567.* And *Spencer* supports this by a like conjecture of *Bochart's* (*De animal. sac. col. 60.*) viz. that כרב comes from an Arabic word (*Bakara*) of the same radicals yet extant in that tongue, and signifying, to plow, terram vomere proscindere. *Spencer, p. 764. Edit. 1684.*

SEE also *Jo. Monæus de aureo vitulo*; *Guffetius's* comment on the word כרב. And *Bonfrerius* upon *Exod. xxv. 18.* And *Deylingius* in his *Obs. sacr. Part II. p. 443.*

Temple were the *same in form* with those described by *Ezekiel*, yet will it not follow that they were placed there as *pictures or similitudes of the Divine Persons*. It has been shewn in a former discourse, that no such inference can be justly made, either from the *name* or the *form* of the figures in *Ezekiel's* visions, much less can it be made from the same form expressed in solid workmanship, as hath been more particularly shewn above. And as most of the reasons which have been before given, against the admission of Mr *H.*'s construction both of the *name* and *thing* in *Ezekiel* and *Genesis*, hold equally good against the same construction of these solid representations in gold, or stone, or wood; I shall not repeat any of them in this place, but refer my reader to them; and shall proceed to consider some passages in Scripture, which have been cited in support of Mr *H.*'s interpretation of the figures on the Mercy-Seat.

THE first in order will be *Lev. xvi. 13.*
 "The Mercy-Seat which is *upon the*
 "*testimony.*" Heb. על העדות. Upon
 which the remark in *Elibu*, p. 40. stands
 thus. "THE EDVTH (*plural*, the
 inter-

268 DISCOURSE II.

“interpretation of which is in this place
 “I think *witnesses*) the representative
 “emblems which were at each end of
 “the ark, *so* under the Mercy-Seat as
 “joint supporters of it. Hereby it is
 “*painly* though emblematically signified,
 “that all the three Divine Persons were
 “the foundation of the grand scheme
 “of mercy or redemption, and were
 “equally engaged or engaged themselves
 “to support it.”

HERE it is taken for granted that
 עדות is *plural*, whereas I have before
 shewn that it is a noun feminine singular.
 So *Marius*; עדות testimonium. Plur.
 עדות. Nec in עדות *Vau* quod apparet
 pluralis signum esse potest cum semper tum
 quiescat. *Pagn.* It is wrote indifferently
 with or without a *Vau* עדת as כרבים
 is for כרובים; but the pronounciation in
 either word will be the same by the
 genius of the language, without regard
 to the Masorite pointings. When the very
 same expression occurs, *Exod.* xxx. 6.
viz. the “Mercy-Seat which is *over the*
 “*testimony*,” it is wrote על העדות.* And
 it

* AND in *Exod.* xxvi. 33. it is said, “thou shalt hang
 “up

it is observable that עדת without the *Vau* is allowed to be singular, and to signify *the testimony* in the *Preliminary Disc.* to *Elibu*, p. 43. where he cites *Exod. xxv. 16.*

“Thou shalt put into the ark *the testimony* “which I shall give thee.” אתהעדת.

It may perhaps be said that the LXX have rendered עדות in this text of *Lev.* now under consideration, by τα μαρτυρια, plural. But this will make nothing in favour of *the witnesses*, when spoken of the *Cherubim*, because it so happens, that in the text just now mentioned as allowed by this Author to be understood in the singular, viz. “Thou shalt put into the “ark *the testimony* (עדת) that I shall give “thee,” *Exod. xxv. 16.* They have rendered it και εμβαλεις εις την κιβωτον τα μαρτυρια α αν δω σοι. By which, as it is evident, they they meant the written law, so I suppose in making it plural, they might have respect to the αι δυο πλακες τα μαρτυρια. שני לוחות העדת the two Tables of the Testimony,

“up the veil under the latches that thou mayest bring “in thither, within the veil עדות ארון.” And in the very next verse. “Thou shalt put the Mercy-Seat “על ארון העדת.” By which it is evident, that the insertion or omission of the *Vau* makes no change in the signification of this word.

270 DISCOURSE. II.

mony, *Exod.* xxxi. 18. And from hence we may account for those other few texts, where they have put the plural for a singular in the Hebrew. That they had no regard to the word as written with or without the *Vau*, will be plain to any who shall examine the passages where it is mentioned with the Ark. עדות is rendered by μαρτυριον, *Exod.* xxvi. 33. by μαρτυρια, *Lev.* xvi. 13. And עדת is μαρτυριον, *Exod.* xxvi. 34. and μαρτυρια, *Exod.* xxx. 6. Even where *Testimony* stands single without mention of the Ark, they render both ways, viz. singular, *Exod.* xvi. 34. and plural, as in the text that hath occasioned this discussion of the word.

As to the remark on this passage, that the *Cherubim* were under the Mercy-Seat, as joint supporters of it, because the Mercy-Seat was על העדות, it doth not rightly agree with the description given in *Exod.* xxv. 19. of the position of the *Cherubim*, which were to be made על שני קצותיו upon the two ends thereof, viz. of the Mercy-Seat. And it appears yet more plainly from ver. 21, 22. that the *Testimony* was in the Ark, and the *Mercy-Seat* above the Ark, and the *Cherubim* above both: and there-

upon CHERUBIM. 271

therefore the *Cberubim* and the Testimony were not the same.

IT is observed by the same author, (*Elibu*, p. 38.) that HeDVTH in the title of the lxxxth Psalm “is the same word “which is used *Exod.* xvi. and translated “*Testimony* ;” which is true, though in *Exod.* xvi. it is wrote without the *Vau* inserted. The use that he makes of this observation follows. “The first verse “clears up the propriety and appositeness “of the title——*Thou that dwelleth between the Cberubims shine forth.* The “supposition of the words HeDVTH and “*Cberubim*, being synonymous expressions, “or relative terms, though giving in some “respects different ideas, reconciles the “title and invocation used in this first verse, “and makes them illustrate and explain “each other.”

WHAT HeDVTH means in the title of this *Psalm*, is more than I can say. By the interlineary version it is rendered *Testimonium*. But our translators have given it, *To the chief musician upon Shoshannim-Eduth*, supposing it to be the name of some musical instrument ; agreeably to the title of the lxth *Psalm*, *To the chief musician*

272 DISCOURSE II.

fcian upon Shofhan-Eduth; in which Psalm, nevertheless, there is no mention of *Che-
rubim* to illustrate and explain the title by. If the words were to be translated literally, they would be rendered, *Psal. lx. super lilium*, or *Psal. lxxx. lilia testimonii*. And whereas *the lily* is said to be called *לשון* from *שש*, six, because it hath six leaves, therefore this hath been presumed to be a six-stringed instrument. How justly I cannot answer. However, there seems no reason from seeing *HeDVTH* in the title of the *Psal*m, to suppose with this author, that it is *synonymous with Cherubim*. This is what hath not been shewn, though it is, indeed, synonymous with the *Testimony* or *Tables of the Law*; and if it is to be taken in it's literal sense, in this title, it must be applied to the *two Tables*, and not to the *Cherubim*.

As to what he further observes, (*ibid.*) that "the *Psal*m is inscribed to *Asaph*,
"the gatherer, i. e. the person to whom
"the gathering of the nations should be,
"of the Gentiles at the first, of the whole
"human race at his second Advent;" it may please persons whose turn of mind is to such kind of allusions. But as an argument

gument it will not, I conceive, have much effect. We know from several texts that *Asaph* was a proper name. And besides *Asaph* the singer, and composer, who was so famous in *David's* days, (1 Chron. xvi. 7.) there was another *Asaph* called *the Seer*, (2 Chron. xxix. 30.) who lived, as Bishop *Patrick* collects, in the times of *Hezekiah*. (See his *arguments of Psal.* l. liii. lxxiii. lxxxii. &c.) And thus the word *Asaph* may be accounted for in the title of the *Psalms*, without having recourse to recondite senses.

AND this may serve also for an answer to our author's "concurring proof from "*Psal.* lxxxii. which is likewise inscribed "to *Asaph* the Gatherer;" and where, he says, "both the meanings of the word "*Gatherer*, just now given, are established "in the last verse, *Arise, O God, judge "the earth, for thou shalt inherit all "nations."*

BUT when he is pleased to add (*ibid.*) "that the sense of the first verse of this "Psalms is disguised by our translation, "which is, *God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, He judgeth among the "gods."* Nay, to say further, that the

T

latter

274 DISCOURSE II.

latter clause of this verse, is "*harsh non-sense, to speak no worse of it,*" p. 39. I think something may and ought to be said in vindication of our translators. As first, that their version is not altogether so harsh as the *new one*, which is here proposed in the room of it, viz.

"*THE Elahim placed in, or for HeDeTH, the irradiator in the middle of the Elahim shall judge.*"

IF it be said that we ought to take the comment * along with the text, as given in

* *Elibu*, p. 38. "The true version ought, I presume, to be thus. The Elahim (foederatores, covenanters, so plural) placed (the verb substantive is understood, and the termination is singular, to shew the Unity of the Deity) in, or for HeDeTH—that is—they were the Testimony or Witnesses there placed.—Then I begin the latter clause of the verse. The Irradiator (EL) in the middle of the Elahim (whose position by being the second Person, was between the other two) shall judge, that is, shall be judge of the earth, or all the inhabitants of it.

"The harsh nonsense (to speak no worse of it) of God's judging among the gods, is thus discharged; and the noble Christian Sense restored, this important doctrine being plainly taught herein, That very Person, one of whose descriptive titles is EL, or the Irradiator, and who is represented in the sacred emblematical figures of the *Cberubim* as the second of them, and therefore placed in the middle, or between the other two, is HE
" who

in *Elibu*, I shall claim the same benefit for our translation, and from a very short comment, all the seeming *barbsness* will be removed from the words.

IN verse the 6th of this Psalm, *Elohim* is translated *Gods*. "I said ye are *Gods*:" this is spoken of Judges or Magistrates, as Mr C. hath shewed in his Sermon, *On the supreme and inferior Elohim*. And the passage is quoted in the New Testament, with this further remark, that *they were called Gods*, to whom the word of God came. From hence then, the first verse will receive an easy exposition *, at least a sensible one. For where is the nonsense that the true God should be said to judge amongst those who are only called *gods*, as being his ministers and vicegerents.

AND if אל in the former part of the verse, which our translators have taken as put collectively for אלים the mighty (and
T 2 which

" who shall gather and judge all nations, who shall be gathered together by his command at the last day for that purpose."

* God standeth, or *presideth* נצב, *Ruth* ii. 5. in the assembly of princes. *Psal.* i. 5. *Exod.* xii. 12. and xxii. 28. 2 *Chron.* xix. 6. ישפט בקרב אלהים judgeth among gods: that is, says *Robertson*, (*Key to the Hebrew Bible*) " God, as the absolute supreme Judge, standeth, is always ready to judge the judges of the earth themselves."

276 DISCOURSE II.

which may signify either *mighty men*, or *angels*, compare it with *Psal.* lxxxix. 7. and *Job* xxxviii. 7.) is not thought to be properly taken in that plural sense, we may take the other version, *God*, in the margin of our Bibles. — אל בעדת אל in the *Congregation of God*; like עדת יהוה *the Congregation of the Lord*, *Numb.* xxvii. 17. and xxxi. 16. and elsewhere. Thus מועדי יהוה occurs several times, but מועדי אל once. *Psal.* lxxiv. 8. where the meaning is, not indeed assemblies, but places of assembly, called in effect מועדי אלהים, ver. 4. compare it with verse the first. The repetition of אל after אלהים is no unusual occurrence in the Scriptures, *1 Sam.* iii. 21. *1 Kings* viii. 1. and xii. 21. and other places.

Now let us see, on the other hand, how “that noble Christian Sense is re-
“ stored, by which the harsh nonsense is
“ discharged — this important doctrine
“ being plainly taught herein, — *That very*
“ *Person, one of whose descriptive titles is*
“ *E L.*” (But it is here only אל without
the demonstrative prefix ה to denote *the*
very person.) Or *the Irradiator.* (An inter-
pretation of אל not warranted, I apprehend,

upon CHERUBIM. 277

hend, by any Scripture) and who is represented in the sacred emblematical figures of the Cherubim as the second of them, (this is the point now in dispute) and therefore placed in the middle or between the other two, (But neither this sense of בקרב, nor that which is given in the marginal note * as a further explanation of it, will answer the position of the faces in the Cherubim as described by Ezekiel) is he who shall gather and judge all nations.

LET the reader determine whether this construction be preferable to that which our version exhibits, either in the text, or in the margin.

THE same author's remark upon תעודה in *Isaiah* viii. 20. having a close connexion with his observations on EDVTH shall be next examined.

"THE people (he says, p. 37.) shewing an inclination to consult wizards are "referred" (*viz.* by *Isaiah* in the text abovementioned) "to the true Oracles

T 3

" under

* "קרב the word here used, signifies, according to "Kircher, an essential or most intimate part when applied "to substances, as the heart in man. Such was the second "Person as described here in the middle of the Divine "Essence as represented in the Cherubim."—Note in *Elibu*, p. 39.

278 DISCOURSE II.

“ under the names of the Law and Testi-
 “ mony *Torah* and *Tebuda*. By *Torah*
 “ is meant the Mosaic Law or two tables
 “ laid up in the ark. By *Tebuda* the
 “ testimony or witnesses *תעודה* as above
 “ in *Exod.* xvi. which were at the ends
 “ of the ark, and these were in other
 “ words the *Cherubim*.”

THAT the Prophet by referring to
 the *Law* and the *Testimony* meant having
 recourse to the Oracles of God will, I
 think, be allowed on all hands. But that
Tebuda therefore signified the *Cherubim*
 is another point, that cannot be admitted.
 It hath indeed a close connexion with
תעודה (which is the word in *Exod.* xvi.)
 being from the same root, and having
 the same signification *secundum aliam for-*
mam præposito ת. But as it is singular it
 doth not seem to denote *witnesses*. Nor
 doth this sense agree with what immedi-
 ately follows. *If they speak not according*
to this WORD. Nor doth it elsewhere
 denote *a witness*. It occurs but in two
 other places besides that before us. One
 of which is four verses higher viz. *Isa.* viii.
 16. “ Bind up the *testimony* (*Tebuda*)
 “ seal the *Law*,” (*Torah*) expressions not
 improperly

improperly used in a literal sense of a book, or written law, nor in a metaphorical sense of the Oracles intrusted with the Prophet. But how *binding up* can be applied to the *Cberubim* in this place is not so easy to understand.

THE other place is *Ruth* iv. 7. "Now this was the manner in former time. A man plucked off his shoe and gave it to his neighbour, and this was a *testimony* (*Tebuda*) in *Israel*." And what forbids it's being interpreted by testimony in this passage of *Isaiab*? If it be said this will make it a tautology, I answer with Mr *Lowth* upon the place, that "the Law and the *Testimony* may signify in general any declaration of God's will, so as to comprehend his *promises*, as well as his *precepts*." There is the like seeming tautology in *Psal.* xxv. 10. "All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth, unto such as keep *his covenant* and his *testimonies*." לִנְצֹרֵי בְרִיתוֹ וְעֵדוּתוֹ. Yet I presume this is a more proper and intelligible version than if one were to render it, by *such as keep his purifier*, and *his witnesses* or his *Cberubim*.

THERE are some other texts relating

280 DISCOURSE II.

to the *Cherubim* in the Tabernacle and Temple cited by Mr *H—n*, in different parts of his works for the support of his construction, which I ought to produce though I am not able to ascertain his meaning in his short comment upon them.

As when he tells us, that “*the Cherubim*, or what they represented, are called *Isaiah* x. 27. פְּנֵי שָׁמֶן the visages, the persons of the oil, for whose sake the yoke was taken off the *Israelites*. I wonder (*says he*) those who are for making the *Cherubim* Angels, and worshipping Angels, could never see to produce this text.” *Data*, Vol. I. p. 125.

Now that it is produced, I am not aware of any service it can do to his hypothesis. The words are rendered in our version, *because of the anointing*. And are interpreted, “for the sake of the Messiah who was to come of that people, *Targ.* מְשִׁיחָא מִן קֶרֶם *a facie Christi*.” See and compare *Psal.* xlv. 7. and *Isaiah* vii. 14. — and ix. 4. When a better interpretation is given, this will be dismissed.

In another place he tells us—“there was doubtless a voice issued from these figures, which directed men to imitate
“ the

upon CHERUBIM. 281

“ the figures, which were therefore called
 “ 2 Chron. iii. 10. *Two Cherubim* מעשה
 “ צעם *the Work*: (the root צעה. צעם
 “ plural. Jer. xlviii. 12. are *Transmigrato-*
 “ *res, carriers away of captives*, doubled, in
 “ a double sense, in a better sense, leading
 “ them in the way to *the tree of lives*)
 “ So Exod. xxvi. 1. מעשה חשב *the work*
 “ *of the counseller*, whether it be among
 “ themselves or to men. The manner
 “ is described by their being oracles :
 “ Acts vii. 38. *who received the living*
 “ *Oracles.*”) &c. *Data*, Vol. I. p. 56.

THE design of this laboured interpreta-
 tion, so far as I can understand it, is to
 pave a way by an unwarranted construc-
 tion of צעה, to an argument that the *Che-*
rubim are the representatives of the re-
 deemers of men, and consequently images
 of the *Rubbim*. He opens this meaning
 a little further, at p. 231. where he says
 that——“ the business of the *Rubbim* is
 “ expressed by צעם, explained by the
 “ actions of men. Jer. xlviii. 12. By
 “ the actions of the *Chaldeans*, who came
 “ from their own country to *Judea*, and
 “ carried home the *Israelites* captives with
 “ them.—So Jer. ii. 20.—את צעה ונה
 a real

282 DISCOURSE II.

“ a real leader into captivity, a very *metrix*, or idolatress, which was the cause
“ of their being carried into captivity.”

BUT the first of these texts is a prophecy of the captivity of *Moab*, and not of *Judea*. “ *Moab* hath been at ease from his youth, ver. 11.—But I will send him *wanderers* that shall cause him to wander; or *travellers* that shall cause him to travel from his own country. For the proper sense of צעה is to remove from one place to another.”

THUS again in the other text, when the same Prophet speaking to God's people says, “ upon every high hill, and under every green tree, (את צעה זנה) thou *wandereſt* playing the harlot,” nothing more seems intended, than the peoples fickleness and proneness to run after other gods, which is properly expressed by צעז.

BUT upon the strength of these two texts Mr H. proceeds to build.

“ So in the only two remaining texts where the word is used, the real business of this compound or double *Cberub*, the lyon and the man described in this tabernacle in *Ezekiel's* temple, is clearly
“ expressed

upon CHERUBIM. 283

“ expressed *Isa. li. 14.* צֶהָ *the redeemer*
 “ *or carrier away of captives from this*
 “ *country to his own, hastens to be loosed,*
 “ *&c. And lxiii. 1. Who is this that*
 “ *cometh from Edom—that is glorious*
 “ *in his apparel? He that is come from*
 “ *another country to carry away captives*
 “ *home with him.*”

THE reader who will turn to the passages will best judge whether any more is meant by צֶהָ in the former, than *an exile*; or in the latter, than *a traveller*, one that *moves forward*. For this is all that seems to be expressed by *the word*, though the context in one place leads us to understand it of *an exile in captivity*; and in the other of one that *moves or marches on with great state and power*.

HE will also judge of the propriety of Mr H.'s expounding these two texts of a *redeemer* from the sense he apprehended the word bore in two other texts, *viz.* that of *a leader into captivity*. It is true, that after his manner of wording it, *to come from another country to carry away captives home*, is applicable to the *redeemer of captives*, as well as to the person who
 leads

284 DISCOURSE II.

leads them into captivity. But if the verb *הָצַץ* really signify, as he would have it, *to carry away captive*, or to be *the cause of captivity*, it cannot be inferred from thence that it should *clearly express* the very contrary, or the *redeeming out of captivity*.

YET Mr *H.* was so well satisfied with this extraordinary transitive sense, as to make no scruple of giving it in *his Remarks*, p. 385. as the version of *הָצַץ* in *Isa.* lxiii. 1. referring to his *Data*, from whence the abovementioned passages are taken, for proof. And his editors thereupon have made no scruple to give it as the true translation of that word, in *Glor. and Grav.* p. 120. where the same text is cited, though Mr *H.* when he wrote that piece, had adhered to the usual version.

BUT to return to the text that relates to *Solomon's two Cherubim of olive-tree*, 1 *Kings* vi. 23.* for it is of those only, and not of the

* THE original is *עֵץ זַיִן* improperly rendered *olive-tree* from whence it is expressly distinguished *Neb.* viii. 15. *עֵץ זַיִן וְעֵץ עֵץ*. The phrase is literally *trees of oil*, as our Translators have noted in the margin. And may denote *the pine, cedar, &c.* The *Alexandrian* copy of the LXX has *ξύλων κυπαρισσίων*. So in *Neb.* hath the Vatican—*φυλλα ελαιας και φυλλα ξυλων κυπαρισσίων*. See *Patrick* on the place.

upon CHERUBIM. 285

the golden *Cherubs* on the ark, that it is said that they were מַעֲשֵׂה צִעְצֻעִים, 2 *Chron.* iii. 10. where *B. Lamy* supposes the LXX read it מַעֲשֵׂה, because they have rendered it by *εργον εκ ξυλων*. * *Vulg. opere statuario.* *Engl. Verf. Image-work*, or as it is in the margin *moveable work, opere motionum, vel mobili*, sc. "eâ arte facti *Cherubes*, "ut sponte mobiles esse viderentur." *Bux.* & alii. The word here is taken for a derivative of צֶעַע, as מַעֲשֵׂה is from מַעַשׂ : and is supposed to denote their being formed in a posture or attitude of *progression*, as preceding the ark ; and making up the *quadriga* or *chariot of the Cherubim*. This is indeed a mere conjecture, but it is such a one as well agrees with the

* THIS version of the LXX, compared with the observations in the note immediately foregoing, will furnish matter for a more probable supposition ; viz. that מַעֲשֵׂה צִעְצֻעִים 2 *Chron.* iii. 10. and עֵץ שֶׁמֶן 1 *Kings* vi. 23. are meant of the same tree, or species of wood. For, it seems, צִעְצֻעִים the quadriliteral verb, not now extant in Hebrew, is found remaining in the *Arabic* dialect : and though it principally signifies *to move* (from whence it appears that our translation by *moveable work* as in the *marg.* or as others understand it *moving work*, is not to be blamed) yet it sometimes signifies *oleo perfudit* ; from whence the noun מַעֲשֵׂה צִעְצֻעִים a plant of an oleaginous and laxative nature. This will account for the *εργον εκ ξυλων*, and might appear a plausible conjecture, if we understood what is truly meant by עֵץ שֶׁמֶן.

286 DISCOURSE II.

the short account we have of these additional *Cherubim* in *Kings* and *Chron.* and of their position in the most holy place. And it is observable, that it was not called the *chariot of the Cherubim*, till *David* gave the pattern of the work, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 18. which was afterwards executed by *Solomon*. Some indeed have supposed, that the ark itself was set upon wheels in *Solomon's Temple*. And the *Targ.* upon 1 *Kings* vii. 33. explaining that text, says, that the work of the wheels of the ten lavers was like the work of the wheels of the *chariot of Glory*, or the ark. And they who apply מַעֲשֵׂה צִעְצְעִים to the *Cherubim* on the ark, understand it of such wheels, made to move every way. But as the Scriptures have not cleared up any of these particulars, I shall leave them and the construction of this difficult text to the judgment of others. And I shall conclude this section concerning the *Temple Cherubim*, with two observations made by the learned author of *Elibu*.

THE first is in his *Preliminary Discourse*, where from p. 42, to p. 54. he gives several reasons to shew, that the supposition of the second Temple being without the *Cherubic*

rubic faces, is a vulgar error in Theology. This indeed, if proved, would cut off the reasonings of those who argue that these symbols were not necessary, nor of that import which Mr *H.* and his followers think, because they were not in the second Temple: and if they were not there the reasoning seems of weight.

I SHALL not enter into this dispute, but shall only take notice, that Mr *H.* is against him in this particular, who supposes all these *things lost and misunderstood* before the coming of our Saviour; and so is the ingenious writer of *Thoughts conc. Religion*, who supposes that God exhibited these emblems in visions to *Ezekiel*, on purpose to preserve the true understanding of them, and thinks it *surprizing that the Jews never thought fit to give the figures he describes a place in their temple.* For, (says he) *it appears evidently, that they had no Cherubim there, for reasons that he afterwards gives from Philo and Josephus, p. 71. and 73. 4to edition.*

THE other observation is in *Elibu*, p. 39. and is as follows.

“ THOUGH some Moderns have questioned whether *Ezekiel's* vision is to be
“ under-

288 DISCOURSE II.

“ understood of the *Cberubim* in the *Sanc-*
 “ *tum Sanctorum*, yet *Irenæus* cites the lat-
 “ ter part of the first verse of the lxxxth
 “ Psalm, and applies it to the Person,
 “ ὁ Καθήμενος ἐπὶ Χερουβιμ.” &c. viz. Christ.

“ THE *Cberubim* are called likewise by
 “ *Irenæus* τα Χερουβιμ τετραπροσωπα—the ani-
 “ mals with four faces; and he says fur-
 “ ther, προσωπα αὐτῶν εἰκονες τῆς πραγμᾶλειας τῆ
 “ οὐκ τῆ Θεοῦ. These visages, or persons,
 “ (as the Greek word properly signifies)
 “ were resemblances of, or served to de-
 “ scribe, the Dispensation of the Son of
 “ God, or, in other words, the Christian
 “ Oeconomy.—The reader will com-
 “ pare this passage of *Irenæus* with the as-
 “ sertions or intimations of those who
 “ would persuade us, that the description
 “ of *Ezekiel's Cberubim* had no relation to
 “ those which were set up in the Holy of
 “ Holies.—And if authority may have
 “ any weight, let that of *Irenæus* be put
 “ in one scale, and as many Moderns as
 “ they please in the other.”

THE reader, when he turns to this pas-
 sage in *Irenæus*, will find that venerable
 Father endeavouring to support the autho-
 rity of all the four Gospels against the
 hereticks

hereticks from hence, viz. that they could not be either more or fewer than *four*: for that is his *thesis* * in the chapter referred to. In maintaining of this position he observes, that as there are *four* regions (Κλιμαλα) of the world, and *four* winds blowing from the four quarters; so the Church dispersed throughout the earth, standeth upon the *four* pillars of the Gospel. In the course of this kind of reasoning he observes, that the Λογος Φανερωθεις, the Son of God, when manifested to the world, gave τετραμορφον ευαγγελιον, as the *Psalmist* had foretold, when he said ο Καθημενος επι Χερουβιμ εμφανηδι. Which passage in the *Psalmist* must be supposed to relate to the *Cherubim* on the Mercy-Seat, and therefore to preserve the propriety of the allegory, must be understood by *Irenæus* to be Χερουβιμ τετραπροσωπα, as well as those in *Ezekiel*.

THIS is immediately followed by another expression relating both to *Ezekiel's*
U *Cherubim*,

* *Ostensio quod neque plura nec minus quam quatuor possunt esse Evangelia.* And after a pretty long introduction, he begins his argument thus. Neque autem plura numero quam hæc sunt, neque rursus pauciora capit esse Evangelia. Επειδην τεσσαρα κλιμαλα τε κοσμου. &c. p. 221. *Ed. Grab.*

290 DISCOURSE II.

Cherubim, and those on the Mercy-Seat.

Και γὰρ τὰ Χερουβιμ τετραπρόσωπα. Καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν εἰκόνες τῆς πραγμᾶλειας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Which being singled out, and detached from the context, seems greatly to countenance Mr *H.*'s *Christian Covenant in Hieroglyphics*: or, Similitudes of the three Divine Persons in the *Cherubim*. Yet it is plain from what follows in *Irenæus*, that he expounded them in a very different sense.

IT is true *πρόσωπα*, as our author observes, properly signifies *persons* in the Greek language. Not that *person* is the first and literal signification of the word, but is it's proper signification in some usages of it. But here it is not the proper; or the obvious meaning of it. But as *τετραπρόσωπα* are the animals *with four visages*, as our author himself renders it, and not the animals *representing four persons*, so the *τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν* must mean their faces and not their persons. Neither are the faces said by *Irenæus* to be *εἰκόνες* of *persons*, but of the dispensation of the Son of God, which he represents as *four fold*, and corresponding in that respect with the four faces in the *Cherubim*, and
with

with the number of the Gospels or Evangelists. The *πραγματεία* * that he speaks of is divided into four periods, or separate successive dispensations, whereof the Gospel Dispensation by *Jesus Christ* is the fourth and last. From whence he concludes against those heretics who presumed to say, there were either more or fewer than four Gospels.

THIS is the sum of the evidence from *Irenæus*, and I shall leave it to the reader to judge what weight it ought to have when put into the scale against other writers, modern indeed, but professedly discussing and examining a subject, which *Irenæus* only introduces occasionally, and slightly touches upon in pursuance of an allegorical exposition of *τετραμορφον ευαγγελιον*.

U 2

IF

* Οποια εν η πραγματεία τε υις τε Θεοις, τοιαυτη και των ζων η μορφη· και οποια η των ζων μορφη, τοιαυτη και ο χαρακτης τε ευαγγελιου. Τετραμορφα γαρ τα ζωα, τετραμορφον και το ευαγγελιον, και η πραγματεία τε Κυριου· και δια τω τεωαρεσ εδοθησαν καθολικαι διαθηκαι τη ανθρωποτητι. μια μεν τε κατακλυσμος τε Νωε επι τε τοξεν· δευτερα δε τε Αβρααμ, επι τε Σεμεν της περιτομης· τειρη δε η Νομοθεσία επι τε Μωυσεως· τεταρτη δε η τε ευαγγελιου δια τε Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου.
p. 223.

292 DISCOURSE II.

IF his authority is so decisive as is pretended, why is not his whole interpretation to be admitted and preferred to any other modern hypothesis? Our author says, indeed, that this passage is cited only to shew that *Ezekiel's Cherubim* are descriptive of the Temple *Cherubim*, and that he has no occasion to consider Irenæus's manner of allegorizing upon this subject. True. But the question will still remain, Whether this opinion of Irenæus, introduced into his allegory, and accommodated to it, be any proper evidence of the fact? If it may be allowed, upon his authority, that the first verse of the lxxxth *Psalms* is a prediction of Christ's giving a *four fold Gospel*, because he so interprets that passage in accommodation to his subject in hand; then his sentiment concerning the Temple *Cherubim* must be allowed to have equal weight. But when all the weight is allowed to this sentiment that our author can desire, against those Moderns who have doubted, whether the form of *Ezekiel's Cherubim*, and the Temple *Cherubim* was the same, yet doth it not follow from hence, as I observed above, that they were

upon **CHERUBIM.** 293

were the *images or pictures of the great Ones*. Irenæus is so far from countenancing *this notion*, that his whole exposition of the four visages is a proof that it never entered into his head.

294 DISCOURSE II.

S E C T. V.

Examination of Texts cited from the Evangelists and Apostles.

IT only remains now, that we consider those passages in the New Testament, which are quoted on this subject by Mr C. Mr H. and others on the same side.

THERE are two words used in the Gospels, which are produced to support their application of *Rub* to Christ.

THE word רב is used in the New Testament, and frequently applied to our Blessed Lord in Greek letters Παῖς, and once or twice in the *Syrian* dialect Παῖς, or Παῖς.

MR C. in his *Sermon*, p. 14. reads it *Rubbi*, as a proof of Christ's being one of the *Rubbim*. "For (says he) he only in propriety was, when on earth, called "*Rubbi*, or *Rabbi*, my great One."

So

So also Mr *H. Remarks*, p. 381.
 "The Hebrew was not the language,
 "when Christ was on earth, but was
 "sometimes spoken then. And if רב be
 "a great One, and Hebrew, and was his
 "title there," (viz. in the Old Testament)
 "the *Jod* might properly be added to
 "Christ when on earth, in speaking, and
 "is writ in Greek letters *my great One*,
 "or in Syriac *Rabboni*, *my great One*."

YET there is not the least doubt, that
 the writers of the Gospels used *Rabbi* and
Rabboni, in that sense only in which our
 translators have rendered it, viz. *Master*,
 according to the interpretation occasionally
 given by an Evangelist himself: Παῖς, ὁ
 λεγόμενος διδασκαλὴ. *John* i. 39. Παῖς
 ὢν, ὁ λεγόμενος διδασκαλὴ. *XX.* 16.

ONE would think these passages were a
 good evidence, both of the true pronun-
 ciation of רב, and the true meaning of
Rabbi in the Gospels. But Mr *H.* has
 found a way to evade it.

FOR after having told us, that as the
 "High Priest represented the Intercessor,
 "who was of the Essence, and one of the
 "*Rubbim*," &c.—and so was "as a
 "type, properly called רב, *my great*

296 DISCOURSE II.

“One,” he adds, “at the last end, the
 “Jews applied this, *founding it Rabbi*,
 “falsely to every one they thought *learned*
 “or *great*, except to Christ, and though
 “unknowingly, truly to him.” *Glor.* and
Grav. p. 136.

THAT is, if I take his meaning right,
 it ought to have been pronounced *Rubbi*;
 but the Jews in our Saviour’s time, and
 even our Saviour himself, as appears by
Matt. xxiii. 8. *founded it Rabbi*. And
 that it meant *learned* OR *great*: which
 disjunctive will provide for either of the
 two interpretations which are now in dis-
 pute. For according to this account *Rabbi*
 might *truly be applied* to Christ, either in
 the sense of *διδασκαλῶς*, or of *μεγας*, where-
 by the point in question is eluded; which
 is, in which of these two senses it was
 spoken of him. If it was spoken of him
 in the sense of *preceptor*, or teacher, and
truly applied to him in that sense, then Mr
H.’s observation is nothing to his purpose.
 St *John*’s explanation of it by *διδασκαλῶς*
 seems a decisive proof of it’s true meaning.
 And so is that other text where our Lord
 tells his Disciples, that “the *Scribes* and
 “*Pharisees* loved greetings in the markets,
 “and

“ and to be called of men *Rabbi*, *Rabbi*.
 “ But (says he) be not ye called *Rabbi*,
 “ for one is your master (καθηγητης) even
 “ Christ, *Matt*, xxiii.” In which words he
 allows and confirms that sense of *Rabbi*
 which Mr *H*. seeks to avoid. How the
 Jews might *abuse and misapply* (*Rem*. 386.)
 the word, is not material to enquire. The
 abovesited texts shew the true use, and
 right application of it in that very instance
 where Mr *H*. would teach us it hath an-
 other meaning.

MR *C*. indeed has an argument to prove
 if I understand it right, that διδασκαλος is
 equivalent to *Rub*, and means, if not di-
 rectly, yet consequentially, *the great One*,
 or one of the Divine *Rubbim*. It is in
 his *Answer to the Observations*, &c. p. 6.
 where he is proving *Rubbim* to be the ap-
 propriated *title* of the Divine Persons.

“ NAY (says he) the second Person
 “ himself in the flesh approves of his
 “ Disciples giving *this title* to him, and
 “ shews the reason of his claim to it.
 “ *John* xiii. 13. *Ye call me*, Master, and
 “ Lord, and ye say well for I AM. EIMI
 “ γαρ. In which last words he asserts his
 “ own

298 DISCOURSE II.

“own necessary existence, or that he was
“a person in the Essence existing.”

BUT it is against all the common rules of construction to interpret *I am*, in this place absolutely (as in *Exod. iii. 14.* or *John viii. 58.*) or otherwise than in conjunction, implied though not expressed, with the foregoing appellatives: as further appears from the words immediately following, *If I then your Lord and Master, &c.* And though רַב may be presumed to have been the Syriac word which is here rendered *Master*, yet we are not to presume it implied necessary existence, or any thing more than what the translation by διδασκαλῶ expresses. Could it have been presumed of the other appellation rendered by ὑπὲρ, that the original word was הַיּוֹרֵה, there might have been some pretence for Mr C.'s construction of ἔμμε. But this I think he would not venture to say: or if he had, the improbability of the conjecture would not have suffered it to take place.

BUT “he (Christ) has this title expressly given him in Greek (says Mr C.)
“viz. *Luke i. 32. He shall be Μεγας* A
“GREAT

“ GREAT ONE. This title is alluded
“ to *John* i. 16.” &c. *ibid.*

THIS is a part of the Angel *Gabriel*’s address to the Blessed Virgin at her Salutation, who used the same word to *Zechariah*, *Luke* i. 15. on the like occasion, and in the same way of prediction of *John the Baptist*’s future greatness *εσαι μεγας*. And we may justly suppose that the same original word, rendered *μεγας* (whatever it was, perhaps *גדול* perhaps *רב*) was used by *Gabriel* on both these occasions if *גדול* the argument is at an end. If *רב* in case that be any proof of Christ’s being one of the *Rubbin*, it is as good a proof that *John the Baptist* was one of them too. Nay by the same kind of argument one might prove from *Matt.* v. 19. that whosoever shall do and teach these commandments *εὖτος αληθυσταί μεγας*——shall be called *i. e.* shall be *Rub* or *one of the Rubbin* in the kingdom of Heaven.

THUS it appears that no more advantage can be taken of *μεγας* in the New Test. as a proper Divine title, than could be taken of *רב* in the Old Test. considered in the same view; as was shewn in the former Dissertation.

BUT

300 DISCOURSE II.

BUT the chief texts in the New Testament that are controverted upon this subject are those in the *Revelations*: where the *Cherubim*, though not mentioned by that name, are thought to be described. Indeed as the ζῶα, called the *beasts*, in St *John's* visions, are of the same denomination, or species of animals, with those that compose the ζῶα called *the living creatures* in *Ezekiel's* visions; and are said by Mr *H.* to be the constant and well known emblems of the Divine Persons, he was, and his friends are, under a necessity of allowing them to be *similitudes of the great Ones*, or *representatives of the Divine Covenanters* in the Apostle's account of them, as well as in the Prophet's: only they are differently placed and circumstanced with respect to each other in the Apocalypse from what they are in the Old Test. These being, as Mr *H.* said, *exhibitions of different scenes.* *Remarks*, p. 373, 397, 402.

THE most obvious difference in the two accounts is in the position of *the man*, who is not placed in St *John's* visions, as in *Ezekiel's*, next to *the lion*, but between *the calf* and *the eagle*. A circumstance that doth by no means favour the supposition

tion of the lion and the man being emblematical of the two natures Divine and Human in Christ, and will be very difficult on that hypothesis to be accounted for.

BUT with some people nothing is difficult. The *Defender of the Plan* in answer to the *Mod. Apology*, where this difference is urged, tells us (p. 45.) that "Mr H. hath said too much upon this subject for him to transcribe."

YET all that I can find Mr H. to have said, is to this effect, that "when *the lion* had conquered, and *the man* was suffering, *the lion* was first, then *the bull*, then *the man*, and lastly the eagle. After that the *lion* and the *lamb* had the Throne to the end of the Revelations." See *Rem.* p. 402.

BUT how the lion can be said to *have conquered* while the man *was suffering*, or how both could be represented in one scene of action, as one person under these different circumstances, he hath not, that I can find, any where explained. He says indeed, *Rem.* 397. (after quoting the verse in *Rev.* where this position of the beasts is described) "*this is a short scene, and the time not to be mistaken.*" But the scenes,
in

302 DISCOURSE II.

in which the beasts are concerned, last to the 19th chapter. And I think we may presume, that in all places where they are mentioned, we are to consider them in the same order of position among themselves, in which we have them described at the verse where Mr *H.* finds his short scene. So that if the separation of the man from the lion in St *John's* first vision of them, denotes the *lion conquering* and *man suffering*, there is all reason to consider (in every place where the four beasts are mentioned) the one as *conquering*, and the other as *suffering*, throughout the *Revelations*.

IN his *Remarks*, *ibid.* and *p.* 398. He attempts to give some account of this extraordinary position of the beasts during his short scene. But it is my misfortune not to understand his meaning therein so clearly, as to pass any judgment upon it. But I take for granted the *Defender of the Plan*, who gives us the account abridged *p.* 45. has done justice to Mr *H.*'s sentiment, when he says that "this being
 " the scene of power giving to the lamb as
 " slain, so the ox, the fire, the wrath which
 " separated the divinity and soul from the
 " body during the death of Christ, stands
 " between,"

“between.”——And this he is pleased to say is *a very good reason: ibid.* And therefore it merits some consideration.

MAY a question or two be asked upon it? Did *wrath* ever subsist between the Father and the Son? Or, if it might have been said in some sense to have subsisted, viz. by way of imputation of man’s offences to the Son, Was it not appeased by the death and sufferings of the Lamb? And is it reasonable to suppose it should be represented to St *John* as yet subsisting after the Lamb was exalted? Or that the separation of Christ’s Divinity and Soul from his Body should be emblematically signified, after their re-union by his Resurrection from the Dead? This would be bringing together into one scene of action, emblems of the different states and conditions of the same Person which could not possibly subsist together, or be jointly ascribed to him, *as his*, at one and the same point of time.

AGAIN; if the ox being placed between the lion and the man, represented the wrath that separated the Divinity and Soul from the body of Christ, Will not the beast *that had the face as of a man*, represent

304 DISCOURSE II.

represent the lifeless body of Christ? If it does, What meaneth that circumstance that this beast, like the others, was *full of eyes before and behind*, (chap. iv. ver. 6.) full of eyes within? ver. 8. And that other of *his giving glory and honour, and thanks, saying, Holy, &c.*? ver. 9.

HERE, if I mistake not, Mr *H.* and this author differ. Mr *H.*'s words are—
 “ Whether after the death of the body,
 “ ’till it’s resurrection, the soul was sepa-
 “ rated from the Essence, I determine not
 “ now.—After he had left the huma-
 “ nity, the influence of the Holy Spirit
 “ was upon, or in it; so while life lasted,
 “ it was full of eyes, ’till it had perform-
 “ ed it’s part, declared *all was finished*, and
 “ given up the Ghost. So though there
 “ was a presence of the inanimate em-
 “ blems, if after that the dead body could
 “ not be full of eyes and act, whether the
 “ soul was so and acted, I determine not,
 “ but I suppose it was full of eyes and
 “ acted.” *Remarks*, p. 397, 398.

THEY who can enter into this sort of reasoning, will judge better of it than I can. The *Defender of the Plan*, who esteems

esteems it to be very good, would do well to make it a little more intelligible.

ANOTHER remarkable circumstance in St John's Visions of the *Zoa*, *Beasts*, is, that they fell down before the Lamb (ἐπεσον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Ἀρνίου) chap. v. 8. And worshipped God, (προσεκύνησαν τῷ Θεῷ) chap. xix. 4. In either place addressing God or the Lamb, with expressions of most exalted adoration.

NOW it is scarce to be conceived, if these four beasts were representatives of the Divine Persons, that they could with any propriety, or without the greatest solecism, be said and described to fall down before, and worship other emblematical representations of the same Divine Nature and Perfections. And therefore, whatever these beasts were emblems of, they could not be *Cherubim* in Mr H.'s sense of that word: it being as contrary to the rational explanation of a vision to say, that one emblem of the Divinity should worship another emblem of it, as it is contrary to the reason of mankind, and to all our notions either of the Godhead or of Worship, to say that the Trinity worshipped

306 DISCOURSE II.

the Trinity, or any one Person in the Trinity.

AND this I think is acknowledged by those who interpret these *Cherubim* of Divine Persons: but then they deny that worship in it's proper sense is any where ascribed to these Divine Similitudes; but alledge that the expressions whereby it seems to be ascribed to them, either do not relate immediately to them; or when they do relate to them, and are to be understood of them, are capable of an interpretation from whence Worship is not necessarily inferred.

“IF it be urged (says the author of *Elibu*, *Prel. Disc.* p. 56.) “ that in verse 8. “ of this vth chapter it is written, that “ *the four beasts*, or ζῶα, *and four and* “ *twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb*, “ and that therefore the ζῶα joined in the “ same act of homage; which the representatives of the Trinity, or the three “ Persons in Covenant, cannot be supposed “ to have done; it may be replied, that “ the word ἐπεσθον rendered *fell down*, does “ not, *simpliciter*, absolutely signify such a “ kind of prostration as is used by a dependent towards the Supreme and Independent

“ pendent Being, by a creature towards
“ the Creator.”

So far is very true. *Falling down*, or prostration is not *simpliciter*, or absolutely, worship. For worship is a peculiar act of *prostration*, (when it is expressed or denoted by that term) distinguished from all others by the nature and supposed intention of the *Agent by whom*, and the nature and supposed dignity of the *Object before*, or *to whom* the prostration is made, i. e. The prostration of a Being capable of intending worship, when it is made with that intention to another Being supposed worthy to receive it, is properly and strictly *Worship*. And every prostration so circumstanced, and so described, will convey *the idea of Worship*. The question is therefore, whether *προσκύβω*, in this text, stands limited by the context to such a *prostration* as denotes *Worship*, exclusive of all other applications of the word.

THE reader must indulge me in being very particular on this article. For as the Gentlemen concerned in defending Mr H.'s hypothesis of the *Cherubim* have taken some pains to discharge, if possible, the phrases abovementioned of *that idea of*

308 DISCOURSE II.

Worship which they appear to convey ; their expositions of them deserve to be very narrowly looked into.

AND first ; with respect to the sense of *επεσθον*, Rev. v. 8. We are directed (*Prel. Disc.* p. 56.) to compare the last verse of this chapter with the 10th verse of the foregoing chapter : from whence the author apprehends *it may well be inferred* that *επεσθον* in v. 8. is not such a kind of prostration as is used by a creature towards the Creator.

THE passage in chap. ivth referred to, is Ver. 9. “ And when those beasts give
“ glory, and honour, and thanks
“ to him that sat on the throne,
“ who liveth for ever and ever,
Ver. 10. “ The four and twenty Elders fall
“ down before him that sat on the
“ throne, and worship him that
“ liveth for ever and ever.”

THE passage to be compared with it is, Chap. v. ver. 14. “ And the four beasts said
“ *Amen* : and the four
“ and twenty Elders fell
“ down and worshipped
“ him that liveth for ever
“ and ever.”

THE

THE author's inference, or observation, from the last of these texts, compared with the former, is as follows.

"IN the last, or 14th verse of the vth chapter it is said, that *the four and twenty Elders*, (and they ONLY) immediately after the high approbation, or AMEN, of *the four beasts*, ζωα, fell down, επεσαν, AND worshipped, προσεκυνησαν, him that liveth for ever and ever." *ibid.*

IT is reasonable to admit, that, in whatever sense επεσαν appears to be applied here to the four and twenty Elders, in the same it should be understood of the four ζωα in the 8th verse. And this brings us to the point on which the issue must turn.

HE proceeds, "Had επεσαν *fell down*, implied an act of adoration, such a *tautology* as the addition of προσεκυνησαν *worshipped*, would not have appeared in such a book, and pressed so close upon the reader." *ibid.*

BUT, if we look only three pages further, viz. p. 59. we shall find the same kind of *tautology* admitted without any remark upon it's impropriety.

"THE hasty *English* reader may possibly suppose from what is said in

310 DISCOURSE II.

“chap. vii. 11. of this book, that the
 “four beasts concurred in paying religious
 “adoration and worshipping God. But
 “the original makes it clear *beyond all*
 “doubt or contradiction, that all the an-
 “gels who stood round about (κυκλω) the
 “throne, and round about the Elders,
 “and round about the four ζωα (and they
 “only here) *fell before the throne on their*
 “*faces, and worshipped God.*”

HERE, I observe, ἐπεσον ἐπὶ προσώπου αὐτῶν
 is allowed to imply *an act of adoration*,
 (and so it is allowed by this author in *Ezek.*
i. 28. as will be observed below) and yet
 the addition of προσεκύνησαν appears in *the*
same passage, and is *pressed equally close up-*
on the reader.

BUT if in either place it is a *tautology*,
 it is one so common both in the *Hebrew*
 and *Greek* Scriptures, that it should not be
 excepted against in this place. — “O
 “*come let us worship, and fall down, and*
 “*kneel before the Lord our Maker.*” *Fal-*
ling down expresses one particular manner
 or act of worship; *kneeling* denotes an-
 other; *saying words of adoration* another;
 and two or three of these are sometimes
 mentioned together, or pressed close upon
 each

each other, and yet, I think, without the imputation of *tautology*. And in the New Testament *προσκυνήσαντες προσκύνησαν*, (*Matt. ii. 11.*) *ἐκὼν προσκύνησας*, (*Matt. iv. 9.*) are instances of the same kind of Pleonasm. And the insertion of the Copulative *καὶ* between the verbs is the common usage * in the *Chaldee* and *Hebrew* tongues; and is an idiom for which St *John* is also remarkable †, as a writer who preserves it more in his Greek, than the other writers of the New Testament do. So that his *ἐπεσάν καὶ προσεκύνησαν*, which our author obliges us to take notice of by putting AND in capitals, is no more than tantamount to *προσκυνήσαντες προσκύνησαν*.

* Thus, what the LXX render by *προσκυνήσαντες προσκύνειτε*, *Dan. iii. 5.* and *προσκύνησας προσκύνησε*, *ibid. v. 6.* are in the original *Chaldee* *ותפלון ותסגדון* and *יסגד ויפל* which are literally rendered in our version—that ye fall down, and worship.—Whosoever falleth not down and worshippeth, and so in many instances of the *Hebrew* tongue.

† Whereas the other Evangelists commonly use *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε*, and *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπον*. He more frequently in his Gospel uses *ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν*, and *ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον*. Abundance of these pleonastick expressions, in which he followed the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* phraseology, are to be met with in his writings. And some, but fewer in proportion in the other Evangelists.

312 DISCOURSE II.

IF we enquire what *επισταν* signifies here, if it doth not mean an act of worship, we are told, *ibid.*

“ *Επισταν* signified an honourable form of
“ attestation (such as became the witnesses
“ HeDI) and an acknowledgment of
“ what was just and due to *the Lamb that*
“ *had been slain.*”

AND the better to countenance this interpretation we are further told that—
“ As both these words (viz. *επισταν* and *προ-*
“ *σχευνησαν*) are used together in the LXX
“ version of the 2 *Chron.* xxix. 30. An
“ explanation of the original Hebrew,
“ from whence their sense *must have been*
“ *taken*, will give the best interpretation of
“ them in this place.” *ibid.* p. 57.

I ANSWER, if this means that the sense of these words every where in the LXX version must be taken from the original Hebrew, I allow it so far, as that they intended to express the sense of the Hebrew by them, and that they must be taken, wherever they can, in that sense which the Hebrew plainly hath. But the *general sense* of the Hebrew words answering to these, will by no means be of any service to our author.

AND

upon CHERUBIM. 313

AND if he means that the sense of these words, in *this particular text* of the *Revelations*, must be taken from the original Hebrew of this *particular text* in *Chronicles*; I ask how that appears, or why they may not be equally well expounded by other texts, in which *falling down* and *worshipping* are mentioned together? and they are frequently so mentioned, both in the *Hebrew* of the *Old*, and *Greek* of the *New Testament*.—If there were any difficulty in finding out their sense from their usage in the Greek Tongue, where should we sooner look for an explanation, or an illustration of them, than in those other passages of this same Apocalypse, where they occur together, are from the same writer, and relate to the same persons, on the like occasions, if any such passages are to be found?

NOW in *Rev. xi. 16.* it is said of these four and twenty Elders, ΕΠΕΣΑΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΑ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΣΕΚΥΝΗΣΑΝ. And *falling down*, when thus accompanied with other correspondent expressions must be allowed, by our author at least, to signify such a kind of prostration as is used by a creature towards his Creator, because ΠΡΟΣΕΚΥΝΗΣΑΝ

314 DISCOURSE II.

ἐπὶ προσώπῳ, or in the Hebrew נפל על פני, (*Ezek. i. 28, & alibi*) is the phrase used to express *that prostration* of *Ezekiel*, which is insisted upon (*Elibu, p. 21. and 25.*) without any addition from προσκυνεω, as an act of religious adoration paid by the Prophet to the *Cherubim*.

IN *Rev. vii, 11.* the same phrase is used, and applied to Angels, as was lately observed in the quotation from the *Prel. Disc.* p. 59. In *Rev. xix. 10. I fell*, (*επεσον*) at his feet to *worship him* (*προσκυνησαι αὐτω*). And the same again, chap. xxii. 8. In both which places *St John's* meaning, speaking of himself, seems very plain, viz. that he *fell down* before the angel with intent to *worship him*.

HERE are now four passages in the *Apocalypse*, whose meaning is so plain and obvious, that they may well serve to clear up the meaning of the other four places, (viz. iv. 10. v. 8. and 14. xix. 4.) whose sense is thought to be less clear and express, without searching for an explanation in the Old Testament.

BUT thither it seems we ought to go: and to one text in particular, in the second Book of *Chronicles*, viz. xxix. 30. And we
are

upon CHERUBIM. 315

are told, *ἐπεσαν* there “ is a translation of
 “ a word that signifies to *bend the head*;
 “ our English Bible rendering it according-
 “ ly in this text of *Chronicles*, they *bowed*
 “ *their heads*, which was a well known
 “ form, even among the Heathens, of ex-
 “ pressing the approbation and sanction of
 “ their supposed Supreme Deity. *Annuit*
 “ likewise expresses this same gentle flexion
 “ of the head in the Latin Poets, and is so
 “ applied to *Jupiter*. *Æneid IX.* &c.
 “ *Prel. Disc.* p. 57, and 58.”

THERE is not a sentence here, but
 what is strictly and literally true. And
 each is so connected with other, as to ex-
 hibit the progress of an argument by a
 chain of propositions not to be denied.
 But no conclusion is drawn from these
 premises. The reader is left to infer what
 he pleases. Yet least he should not make
that inference from them which is only
 pointed to by the general air of the pas-
 sage as it lies in the text, there is a note
 in the margin, in which the said inference
 is made to his hands: for there he is told,
 that the verb in *Chronicles*, of which *ἐπεσαν*
 is the translation; is—— “ קדר *incurvare*
 “ *verticem*. קדקור *vertex capitis*. So that

“ *ἐπεσαν*

316 DISCOURSE II.

“ *επεσαν* here, must have the same meaning with *κεφαλη καλανευσομαι*, in *Homer*.
 “ *Il. I. 524.* or *επεκραιαινε κρονιων. Il. II. 419.*”

THIS is a very extraordinary way of reasoning. St *John* says, *Rev. v. 8.* that the four beasts *επεσον*, before the Lamb. But the learned author tells us, that the falling down doth not signify worship (though it hath that signification over and over in this book, and the rest of the Scripture). For in one single passage, viz. *2 Chron. xxix. 30.* it is in the *LXX*, the translation of a word (*קרע*) which signifies *bowing the head*. It must, indeed, be owned that *bowing the head* there was an *act of worship*, for the very words are, *they bowed their heads and worshipped*. But still bowing the head is a motion not very different from *nodding the head*. And *nodding the head*, though never mentioned in Scripture, is in *Homer* a motion, by which his supreme deity, *Jupiter*, gives his assent. And therefore the falling down of the four beasts in the *Revelations*, signifies such assent and nothing more.

IF this be a just representation of the argument, as I think it is, let me intreat the

the Gentleman who offered it, and for whom I have a real respect, to consider seriously whether an hypothesis ought not rather to be given up, than defended thus.

I HOPE it is needless, and yet I beg leave to say somewhat farther on the subject. Had קרר occurred only once in the Hebrew Scriptures, or at least only once in company with שחה, the Hebrew word for *προσκυνεω*, we might not have been so well able to ascertain it's meaning or use: or had *κλινω* in the LXX been a word very rarely used, there might have seemed room to doubt of it's true meaning in this application of it. Or had our translators in *this text* of *Chronicles*, only rendered קרר by *bowing the head*, it might have been with more probability insinuated, that they meant no more by that expression in *this place* than *bending the head*, or a *gentle flexion of the head*.

BUT none of these things can be pleaded to reconcile us to our author's inference.

קרר is a word of common occurrence; and though it's primary signification may be *incurvare verticem*, yet it is almost always joined

318 DISCOURSE II.

joined with שחך, and in such a manner as to exclude the idea of *nodding* by way of *assent* or *attestation*. It is most generally rendered in the LXX by κυπῶ *, and only once, by, I think, a stronger word πῶπῶ, and that happens to be in this very text which is appealed to for it's signifying something that is *not worship*. But the meaning

* *Exod. iv. 31.* Κυψαῖ ὁ λαὸς προσεκύνησε. *Neb. viii. 6.* Εκυψαν καὶ προσεκύνησαν. &c. Sometimes the Hebrew is more explicit, as *Exod. xxxiv. 8.* ויקר ארצה וישתחו. LXX. Κυψας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν προσεκύνησε: plainly to the same sense with that place in *Job, chap. i. ver. 20.* ויפל ארצה וישתחו, πρὸς ὧν χαμαὶ προσεκύνησε. Again, *2 Chron. xx. 18.* ויקר ארצה מפני אלהים. Κυψας ἐπὶ προσώπον αὐτῶν. Spoken of King *Jehoshaphat*, of whom it is not said (by a rare omission of שחך) that he *worshipped*, but *worship* is nevertheless denoted in the phrase as it is used: The context requiring it to be so understood. One would rather suspect, indeed, that this verb was not omitted in the copies used by the *Syriac* and *Arabic* interpreters, for they both add, & adoravit. And the *Vulgate* seems to imply that that שחך in this part of the verse is superseded by השתחוות at the end of it. *Josaphat ergo & Juda, & omnes habitatores Jerusalem ceciderunt proni in terram coram Domino, & adoraverunt eum.* The reader also may consult and compare *Ruth ii. 10.* *1 Sam. xx. 41. xxiv. 9. xxviii. 14. 2 Sam. i. 2. ix. 6. xiv. 4, and 22. &c.* These and the like places must be understood of low obeysance, humbling and bowing the body, and ought in all reason to govern the sense of קרד whenever it is used along with the Hithpahel of שחך as an act performed to, or before the Deity.

upon CHERUBIM. 319

meaning of the Greek interpreters cannot, I presume, be reasonably doubted, because they have expressed the same original words (וִיקְרוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ) by καμψάντες τα γόνατα προσεκυνήσαν, in 1 Chron. xxix. 20. and by ἐπεσαν καὶ προσεκυνήσαν, in 2 Chron. xxix. 30. And doth the latter imply *nodding of the head* more than the former?

AND whosoever takes the trouble of examining the English versions of קָרַד by *bowing the head*, throughout the Scriptures, will find that they do no ways favour, as is represented, the sense of *gently bending the head in token of approbation*.

HAD St John, indeed, in the Apocalypse used εὐδοκῆσαν instead of ἐπεσαν, the LXX version might have been with more justice appealed to for that sense of the verb קָרַד because וִיקְרוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ in Gen. xxiv. 26. is rendered by εὐδοκῆσας προσεκυνήσε: and again at ver. 48. But even here the sense of the Hebrew will not be affected by this uncommon version of it. But how St John's ἐπεσαν may signify εὐδοκῆσαν, because the verb קָרַד which is twice rendered by εὐδοκῆω in the LXX, is once rendered therein by ὠπῶ, seems very difficult to discover.

FROM

320 DISCOURSE II.

FROM this single instance we may learn, under what limitations we ought to accept our author's observation in the aforesaid note to page 57, which was intended to support his new version of *ἐπεσαν* in the Revelations. viz. "That the way of interpreting the New Testament Greek by the Hebrew, from the translation of the LXX, hath been used by very learned men long ago, who thereby teach us to use the version of the LXX, as the best Lexicon to help us to explain the Greek Testament, by tracing words to their original roots in Hebrew, wherever the words occur in both Testaments: and this must be the most sure method, since thus we interpret Scripture by Scripture." &c.

THE rule may be good in general, but we see how it may be misapplied in particular cases. Neither is there occasion to have recourse to this method, when the sense of any Greek word in the New Testament may be sufficiently ascertained by comparing it with the Greek of the same writer. To find, for instance, the sense of *Ἀγγελοι*, *Rev.* i. 20. where the Apostle speaks of the *Angels* of the seven Churches;

we

We are first to look to the use of the word in the two following chapters, which contain what was to be spoken or wrote to the *Angel* of the Church of *Ephesus*, ii. 1. the *Angel* of the Church in *Smyrna*, ver. 8. and so on, to the rest of the *Angels* of the seven Churches. But should any one apply for the interpretation of this word, to the Hebrew of the Old Testament through the LXX version, and fix on a particular text, as *Psal.* xcvi. 7. where the LXX have rendered אלהים by αγγελοι, and then expounded αγγελοι in *Rev.* i. 20. by the first or radical sense of אלהים, he would interpret Scripture by Scripture, just in the same manner that our author has done in expounding επεσαν, *Rev.* v. 14. by the primary sense of קרר, because that verb is once rendered by επεσαν in the LXX, 1 *Cbron.* xxix. 30.

To do justice to the learned author, he is so far from degrading or lowering the import of the other word προσκυνω, connected with επεσαν in the text, that he exalts it, by tracing it to it's original in the Hebrew, (viz. שחא in *Hithpael*) into a sense almost above comprehension. For besides all that has been usually conceived

322 DISCOURSE II.

to be implied in it, he discovers a new sense, force, and beauty in it, from it's application to the Heavens *, from whence we are to take *the idea*. Yet I cannot but think, that his application of it to *the Elders*, in the utmost latitude, requires a sense for it's concomitant *וּמִלָּא*, something more exalted and correlative than *an assenting motion of the head*. For the meaning of the passage *under his construction*, if I mistake not, will come out thus. That the

* *Prel. Disc.* p. 58. "The reader will find in *Neb.* ix. 6. the *true construction*, and sense of this word for *worship*, where it is said in the English, *The Host of Heaven worshippeth Thee*. The just translation is, I think, the Host of the Heavens are כִּשְׁתוּחִי in a posture of incurvation, or continual prostration of themselves to, or before Thee. Here is true natural knowledge, and sound Divinity built upon it as a sure and intended foundation, both uniting to refute the idolaters of these powers, and referring their worshippers to the very object they worshipped to teach them their duty. since that very object was continually paying homage to the Creator of it's self, and of all things. The noun here is in the form of *Hithpael*, and so describes the heavenly powers of Fire, Light, and Air reciprocally, and mutually acting in and upon themselves, in effecting this peculiar rotation and incurvation, constantly bowing themselves, and falling quite down, as it were, before their Creator. Behold a mine of Philosophy and Theology contained in a single word, when it shall be skilfully worked, and laid open!—"

the four and twenty Elders may not be supposed from their action, described by *επεσαν*, to have prostrated themselves, (that were making *προσεκυνησαν* a tautology not to be met with in such a book as this) but they must be rather supposed by a gentle flexion of the head, to have made acknowledgment of what was just and due to him that liveth for ever and ever. Whereas, from their other action described by *προσεκυνησαν*, they must be supposed to have "prostrated their whole body, kissing the ground as it were (according to the Greek) by falling flat upon it, to declare the greatest veneration for the object of worship." &c. p. 58. *Prel. Disc.*

It would be needless to make further enquiry into the sense of *επεσαν*, when spoken of the beasts, chap. v. ver. 8. (being the text for the sake of which, this new distinction hath been offered) because it was proposed, that the meaning of it should be determined by the interpretation of the same word, in it's application to the Elders, at ver. 14. which has been considered. And if from what has been said, it shall be thought that the construction of *επεσαν* by קדר in the sense of κατανευω is

324 DISCOURSE II.

set aside. Then ΕΠΕΣΟΝ ΕΥΩΠΙΟΝ ΤΑ ΑΡΧΙΑ, reported of the ζωα, v. 8. will stand in it's full force and propriety, denoting an act of adoration. And if it be requisite to bring it's parallel out of the Old Testament, we may cite 2 Chron. xx. 18. ΕΠΕΣΟΝ ΕΥΑΝΤΙ Κυριου, the LXX version of נפלו לפני יהוה. The word which properly answereth in Hebrew to the Greek εωπια, being נפל and not קר.—Then also what our author gathers (in the remainder of his note at p. 57. *Prel. Disc.*) from AMEN * being pronounced by the four beasts only, as an act of high approbation, will not be conclusive

* “ As the pronouncing the *Amen* was the peculiar part
 “ of the four ζωα in the celebration of this Divine Hymn,
 “ it seems to point out distinctly, how far they were concerned in the επεσαν, *falling down*, abovementioned.
 “ This manner of assenting and ratifying is equivalent to
 “ the assenting commanding NOD of *Homer's Jupiter* ;
 “ whose part herein might probably be described in this,
 “ as well as other respects from the true Divine Original.
 “ The four ζωα, or persons represented by them, *assented*
 “ *and ratified*. The four and twenty Elders *assented and*
 “ *worshipped*. How then can the *Amen* in the *Revelations*
 “ be supposed necessarily to imply the assent of created
 “ Beings ? I beg leave to suppose, that Heaven and Earth
 “ might shake and resound upon the pronouncing this
 “ *Amen*, and the giving this ratifying NOD of the four
 “ ζωα, or living *Elahim*.” Note to p. 57, and 58.
Prel. Disc.

clusive against *ἐπεσθαι*, being understood as an act of proper adoration.

BUT the inconclusiveness of this argument from the *Amen* of assent, will more fully appear in the discussion of the other text to be considered relating to the worship of the beasts.

IT is chap. xix. ver. 4. where it is said that the beasts fell down, and worshipped God.

TO this our author thinks it sufficient to answer. *Prel. Disc. p. 60.*

“FROM what has been observed concerning the distinction of the several parts which were performed by the four ζῶα, and the four and twenty Elders in the above cited places: We have authority, I think, to suppose the same distinction in any after passage where that distinction is not specified and expressed, as in the ninth chapter, 4th verse —where we read, *And the four and twenty Elders, and the four beasts fell down and worshipped God.*” &c.

HERE we see the reason why *ἐπεσθαι* was so industriously represented as corresponding with קרר, and interpreted of a nod of assent. It was to introduce a distinction

326 DISCOURSE II.

that might serve to evade the objection from *ὑποεξουσιοῦ*, and more depended upon it than at first sight would be suspected. For though the issue of the dispute about the beasts *falling down*, would not seem much to affect another text, where they are expressly said *to worship*; yet we find now, that it is thought of so much consequence, if determined in favour of the new distinction, as to over-rule by it's authority the plain words of another text.

BUT, with our author's leave, we are not to suppose the same distinction in any after passage, where it is not specified or expressed, if that after passage will not admit it, but forbids it, and excludes it as a faulty distinction, founded on some misapprehension or mistake. To interpret Scripture by Scripture is right: and what is not expressed fully in one place, may be very explicitly delivered in another. We may justly argue from what is clear and plain, in interpreting what is less so: but not *vice versa*, from what is not expressed, or is obscurely expressed in one place, against what is clearly expressed in another. No distinction that contradicts a plain text is good for any thing.

I HAD

I HAD given one instance before of what I am now observing, (I think, not an improper one) viz. that it was reasonable to interpret *προσκύνηω* in four texts in this book of *Revelations*, where the meaning of it is questioned, or might be thought less evident, by the four other places where it occurs *on the like occasions*, with adjuncts and circumstances sufficiently declarative of it's meaning. But it will not hold on the other hand, that the more explicit and copious expressions shall be limited and interpreted by the concise ones.

So it is likewise with regard to this other word *προσκύνηω*. From it's being in this text, (viz. chap. xix. 4.) plainly spoken of *the beasts* as well as of *the Elders*, one may justly infer, that worship might be ascribed, in former texts to the *beasts*, as well as to the *Elders*, by phrases importing worship, though they may not so evidently and strongly express it as *προσκύνηω* does. But then, on the other side, it cannot be presumed with any appearance of probability, that, because those phrases in former texts do not *simpliciter*, or absolutely, signify adoration, when spoken of

328 DISCOURSE II.

the *beasts*; therefore a word which is acknowledged properly to express worship, may not be expounded in it's proper sense, when spoken of the *beasts*, though by all the rules of diction and grammar it relates to them, and is governed by them as a verb is by the noun in the nominative case.

Και επεσαν οι πρεσβυτεροι οι εικοσι η τεσσαρες, η τα τεσσαρα ζωα, η προσεκυνησαν τω Θεω τω καθημενω επι τη θρονω λεγουτες, Αμην, Αλληλεια.

BUT here, says our author, "The words for *beasts* are with an article τα τεσσαρα ζωα." *Prel. Disc.* p. 60.

AND the words for the Elders are with two articles, οι πρεσβυτεροι οι εικοσι. But no use, I think, can be made of either of these remarks to the subject in hand.

"THESE, (viz. the beasts) may be supposed to be principally concerned in pronouncing *the Amen*, as the four and twenty Elders (πρεσβυτεροι) were in saying (λεγουτες) *Alleluia*." *Prel. Disc.* p. 61.

BUT the words in the Greek are λεγουτες Αμην Αλληλεια. Both the words being to be ascribed to the Elders: to the Elders *only*, if the remark upon λεγουτες be just: to the Elders and Beasts *jointly*, if the said remark

mark be insignificant. Either way the intended distinction can have no place.

WE were told lately (note at p. 57.) that "the pronouncing the *Amen* was the "peculiar part of the four ζωα." On this peculiarity the distinction is founded, and applied to the exposition of this text. p. 60. Now it is supposed to be their principal part. By a further observation Rev. vii. 12. it was the principal, or, in our Author's term, peculiar part of the *Angels*, and it appears by this text now under consideration, that the Elders were concerned in the pronouncing of it as well as the *beasts*.

THERE is a note upon λεγουτες. *Prel. Disc.* p. 61. that deserves consideration.

"DR Hammond says, under the note
 "(i) ver. 8. of the ivth chapter, *In this*
 "*verse it is evident that the phrase full of*
 "*eyes belongs to the living creatures (ζωα)*
 "*and not to the wings: for so the Greek*
 "*γεμουλα, full, concludes, which agreeth with*
 "*ζωα, creatures, but cannot with πτερυγας,*
 "*wings. By parity of reason and gram-*
 "*mar may it not be said, that λεγουτες were*
 "*the πρεσβυτεροι only who united both in the*
 "*Amen and Alleluia, or falling down and*
 "*worshipping, as the Greek word λεγουτες*
 "*agreeth*

330 DISCOURSE II.

“agreeth with *πρεσβυτεροι*, but not with “ζωα?”

IT ought to be observed here,

FIRST, that many of the MSS. * and the edition of *Bengelius* have *εν καθ' εν αυτων εχον*, instead of *εν καθ' εαυτο εχον*. And almost all the MSS. and several editions have *γεμουσα* for *γεμουσα*. And both readings are approved by *Bengelius* and *Wetstein*. And if they be true there is no room for *Dr Hammond's* remark.

BUT secondly, supposing the common reading true, how doth it follow from thence that *προσκυνησαν*, ch. xix. 4. doth not agree with *ζωα*, or may not be interpreted as their act as well as the act of the Elders?

HAD *Dr Hammond* argued that because *γεμουσα* ch. iv. 8. did not agree with *πτερυγας* the wings of the beasts, therefore the verb in the immediately preceding sentence *εχον ανα πτερυγας*, was not to be understood of the *beasts*; then, by parity of *such* reason and grammar, it might be inferred, that
because

* BESIDES the *Alex.* MS. a variety of others are mention in *Milli's* Test. *Oxon.* 1707. And *Gregory's*, *Oxon.* 1703.

because λεγούτες doth not agree with ζωα, the verb προσεμύνησαν, which goes before, cannot be applied to them neither. But Dr *Hammond*'s observation, as grounded on the reading of the copy he used, is very just, while what is inferred by our Author on the appearance of the same authority, chap. xix. 4. seems very wrong. For let it be supposed, that λεγούτες there relates to the Elders *only*, and that they united with the beasts in pronouncing the *Amen*, doth it follow that the beasts did not unite with the Elders in *worshipping* too, which is ascribed equally to the beasts and to the Elders independently on the remark upon λεγούτες? But there is no room to insist on λεγούτες relating to the Elders only. — The ζωα being agents and joined with other agents expressed by the masculine gender, it was natural enough to express the act of both in the masculine; especially since, if it had been expressed in the neuter it might seem to be the act of the ζωα without the πρεσβυτεροι. And referring λεγούτες to the πρεσβυτεροι only, when ζωα comes between them and λεγούτες, is a much harsher thing in syntax than such a change in gender.

332 DISCOURSE II.

THE argument which is rather insinuated in this note than expressed, seems to lie thus. — *Amen* is connected with *ἐπισαυ*, and both concur as expressions of the honourable form of attestation, or the part in which the beasts were principally concerned. Whereas *Alleluia* appertains to the *adoration*, the proper part assigned to the Elders: and *λεγουτες* being to be understood of the Elders only, they must be presumed to have united with the beasts in pronouncing the *Amen*, and in the form of assenting denoted by *falling* down; but the *Alleluia* and the *act* that accompanied it, the *worship*, as these belonged only to the Elders, the the beasts were not concerned in them. But this I humbly conceive doth not expedite and clear up the matter: because we are as expressly taught in one part of the verse, that *the beasts did worship* as we are taught in the other part of the verse, *the Elders said Alleluia*.

AGAIN. If the saying *Amen* be so connected with the *falling down* (whatever the meaning of *ἐπισαυ* be) that to whomsoever *the word* is ascribed, *the act* must be ascribed also: and if the pronouncing

nouncing *Alleluia* be so appropriated to the act of *adoration*, that the persons concerned in the one must be concerned in the other also; (as is suggested in the note above-cited) then it appears further, that as the beasts are expressly said to *worship*, as well as to *fall down*, they must be understood to say *Alleluia* as well as *Amen*, notwithstanding the observation upon λεγουσιν, or any illustration of it taken from Dr *Hammond's* note upon γεμουσα.

BUT it may not indeed appear so to every body: we differ sometimes very widely in our opinions. "There is *no more reason*" (says this Author) for our supposing, "that is, I think, *none at all*, that the "Elders and beasts joined here throughout in both parts, viz. of *falling down* "and *worshipping*, than that the Elders "were more honourable than the beasts, "because mentioned before them in this "place, or than the translators had for "rendering the word ζωα beasts." *Prel. Disc.* p. 61.

WITH submission, the cases here put are not parallel. That the beasts and Elders joined throughout in both parts of *falling down* and *worshipping* is a plain narrative,

334 DISCOURSE II.

narrative, and admits of no suppositions or distinctions to invalidate it. But the other two points are mere incidental questions of which people may judge as they list. Let them gather what they please by conjecture from the *prelation* of the Elders in order of narration, or from the inaccuracy of the translators in rendering ζωα; yet that these same ζωα, whether they be rendered *animals*, *wights*, *living creatures*, or whether they be placed before or behind the Elders, did προσκυνεῖν, *worship*, is an assertion not to be conjectured or distinguished away.

As for the supposition, (which our Author can see no reason for, nor I neither) of *the Elders being more honourable than the beasts, because mentioned before them*, let them who make it explain and defend it. Yet it is fortunate enough that the Elders happen to be *first* mentioned here, and ch. vii. 11. because had they been put *after* the four beasts, as in ch. iv. 10. v. 8. their situation in the texts might have served for an handle, which our author might have laid hold on in favour of his own sentiment, *viz.* that the beasts *fell down*, but did not *worship*.

ship. Whereas in this text ἐπεσαν being separated from ζῶα by πρεσβυτεροι intervening, and προσευχυσαν separated from πρεσβυτεροι by ζῶα intervening, there is no room left for any such-like subterfuge.

BUT “*Zῶα is the translation of Ezekiel’s החיות.*” And our translators had no reason to render ζῶα *beasts*. Though this is nothing to the point in hand, yet I allow that a more proper word might have been used by them.

“THEY have been softer in translating החיות in Ezek. i. and x. *living creatures*, though even that is an injurious translation.” *ibid.* p. 61.

INJURIOUS only on supposition that the following conjectural exposition proves a true one; for otherwise, a more proper rendering than they have given by *living creatures* cannot, I believe, be proposed.

“THE words דמות החיות have a feminine termination to denote, I presume, their being only substitutes or emblematical representatives of החיים the original *true living Ones*.—Should these things be so, what must be thought, or what must become of such (if any such
“ have

336 DISCOURSE II.

“ have been) who have designedly given
 “ such degrading translations and notions
 “ of the *Elabim* HaCHIIM.” *ibid.*

SHOULD these things be so, our translators have undoubtedly given, though undesignedly, a degrading translation of דמות הדתות. But this may be said in their vindication, that what is here suggested as the true translation, was probably never heard of, in their time, among the Expositors.

THEY have rendered דמות singular, (as I think all others have done, 'till Mr H. made it plural) being a noun feminine of the same termination and form with עדות testimony, and מלכות reign or kingdom. And that it should be understood singular in the visions of the living creatures, appears from *Ezekiel*, chap. i. ver. 5. דמות להנה אדם *they had the likeness of a man.* And ver. 16. ודמות אחד לארבעתן *they four had one likeness.* Is the word plural in either of these texts? And ver. 28. הוא יהיה מראה דמות כבוד יהוה *this was the appearance of the likeness of the Glory of the Lord*, as our version stands allowed and unblamed, *Elibu*, p. 21. What authority therefore our author has for it's denoting
substitutes

substitutes or *representatives*, is not shewn, since דמיות the plural noun is no where used.

THE translators have also taken דחיות for the plural of חיה or חית, and have rendered it by the softest word they could have used, without departing from the obvious and known sense of the original word. They did not seem to be at all aware, that החיים *Viventes*, (or *the living Ones*, masculine) was ever used in the feminine plural; or that it should have a feminine termination when used of *substitutes* or *emblems*. Neither did they seem to have any apprehension when they called them *Creatures*, that they had so close an affinity with the *Creators*, or were the *representatives* of HaCHIIM. When these things are considered in their favour, they must be acquitted of all design in giving an *injurious translation*.

ESPECIALLY when we further recollect, that the very first time they met with this expression in *Ezekiel*, it was without the demonstrative ה. Chap. i. 5. דמות ארבע חיות, which gave no intimation of their relation to the emphatical החיים. And though they found it elsewhere with the

338 DISCOURSE II.

ה prefixed, what should induce them to think ארבע *four* living ones, could be a proper expression or *emblematical representation of the original true living Ones*, or three Persons in the Divine Essence. Or what should induce them to take such particular notice of חיות *scem.* when they found the masc. pronoun להם at the end of the very next verse, ver. 6. and רגליהם, ver. 7. and כנפיהם repeated in ver. 8. and 9. and ארבעתם as well as ארבעתן in ver 10. As I know not therefore of any who have *designedly* given a *degrading* translation here, so I think it plain that our translators have not given one, even undesignedly, but have given a very right one.

THERE is something said a little lower, viz. at p. 62. of *Prel. Disc.* as it were, on purpose to obviate the difficulty of *four living Ones* made to stand for *three Divine Persons*, viz. that “The *four living Ones* “ τα τεσσαρα ζωα, here, and in the *Revelations*, set forth three Persons of the Essence, with the man taken in, and made “ one with it in the Person of Christ.” But how can the assumption of man be said to increase the number of *the living Ones*?

Ones? If it cannot, what is meant by *four living Ones*?

OUR author had said at p. 40.—“When the first Symbol, or *Tree of the living Ones* (given during the state of innocence) was removed, a change of condition introduced a change of the symbol suitable to the alteration made in man’s new estate.”

BUT then the change of the symbol must occasion a change of it’s name. For as man was, according to this hypothesis, taken into the new symbol of the Divine Persons, it could no longer be called by any of their incommunicable names. For man, not being one of the true original HaCHIM, the representation which included him, could with no more propriety be denominated from *that word* (as the first symbol is said to have been) than it could from *Elabim*, because man was not one of the original Covenanters. This reason given by Mr H. and Mr C. (as was observed above) why the symbol could not be called *Che-Elabim*, holds stronger against it’s being termed *an image* of HaCHIM. And therefore דמות החיות doth not seem

340 DISCOURSE II.

to be justly interpreted by *the substitutes of the living Ones.*

I SHALL only observe further, that as the first symbol in Paradise was, according to the account given at *p. 40. Prel. Disc.* עץ החיים; therefore the feminine termination is no rule for symbols, or doth not denote their being *only substitutes*, as is *presumed* in the foregoing passage.

BUT it is time now to enquire, what solution Mr *H—n* gives to the difficulties that attend his exposition of the *Cherubim*, from these acts of adoration that appear to be ascribed to them in the *Revelations*.

THE *Examiner Examined* tells us, at the end of the note at *p. 81.* that the *Remarks*, (viz. Mr *H.*'s) from page 31, to *p. 137.* (i. e. *new edition*, from *p. 395*, to *p. 402.*) have said enough to clear up this matter.

I HAVE examined the pages referred to, and if one may judge of the difficulties he was under how to deal with this point, by his manner of expressing himself upon it, he was under no small perplexity.

HE tells us, that “ when the Person in
“ the Essence, was by covenant possessed
“ of all Power, and was to have Glory and
“ Adoration——whose representation was
“ *He*

upon CHERUBIM. 341

“ *He that sitteth upon the Throne*, and whose
“ *representation was the Lamb—395—6.*
“ *After the Essence had performed his*
“ *part, he claimed his right, and all power*
“ *was surrendered, p. 397. The power*
“ *and the administration, or the exercise*
“ *of it was transferred.” p. 398.*

THAT all power was given to the Lamb in consequence of the Covenant doth not, I conceive, come up to the point now in question. For *when it is said*, as St Paul argues, that *all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted who did put all things under him.* The Father is not supposed to have divested himself of all power and dominion, when he invested the Lamb with the emblems of Divinity; or to have humbled himself to the condition of a creature, when *he exalted his Son with his Right-Hand to be a Prince and Saviour.* He gave to the Θεανθρωπος a right to the adoration of all creatures in Heaven and Earth, and that *all Men* should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. But as he cannot be supposed to have ceded or transferred to him his own right to worship; so neither can he be supposed to have acknowledged or recognized the Son's

342 DISCOURSE II.

investiture with the like right, in any such manner as could be emblematically represented by acts and words descriptive or expressive of the infinite inferiority, and absolute dependency, that is necessarily included in the idea of worship.

CHRIST, indeed, is represented as sitting on the Throne: but not in contradistinction to the Father. Himself saith, *To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my Throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his Throne.* Rev. iii. 21.—And he that is described by *sitting on the Throne*, is a different person from the *Lamb*, Rev. v. 13.—vi. 16.—vii. 10.

WHEN Mr H. comes p. 404. to the text where it is said *the four beasts fell down before the Lamb*, he interprets it of something “which the typical Presence “under the Law, in this form, surrendered “ed to the real Presence of the Essence “in Christ the Lamb under the Gospel.”

BUT whatever was *surrendered*, if the surrender was made *in the posture* and *by words of adoration*, it was still properly *worship*. So that the objection is not thereby removed.

BUT

BUT as I cannot be sure of Mr H—'s meaning in what he alledges on this subject, I shall refer the reader to his own explanations at large in the places above cited: and shall rather enquire how these difficulties are got over by the Gentleman who refers us to him, and who must have known his mind and meaning better than I can.

IN a note (*p. 79. Examiner Examined*) he says, "it is the cession of all power
" from the two other persons in the Tri-
" nity, which is in this place (*Rev. v. 8.*)
" represented by *the four beasts falling*
" *down, and paying homage to the Lamb.*"

BUT *paying homage* is a phrase too ambiguous to rest the construction upon. In it's proper or forensic sense it cannot be applied here. And in no sense can God the Father Almighty pay homage; *homage*, indeed, is included in *worship*, but is far from being the whole of it. But whatever sense it may carry on other occasions, yet the sense of it, if it be used on this occasion, must be so exalted in this context, as to make it æquipollent with *adoration*: and the objection designed to be evaded by it, will stand nevertheless in it's

344 DISCOURSE II.

full force. For *paying homage* to an *object of adoration*, in *words* expressing *adoration*, and in a *posture* descriptive of it, can amount to nothing less than *worship* properly so called: or to an action that cannot be ascribed to the Divine Persons or their Representatives, as such. I would not use harsh words, but I beg the Patrons of this notion of the *Cherubim* to consider *well*, what consequences are deducible from it.

AND whereas there is an expression in the *New Song*, said to be sung by *the beasts* and the *Elders*, viz. *Thou hast redeemed us*; which cannot be spoken or sung by the said beasts if they were emblems of the Trinity. This author takes some pains to shew, that the text will allow of another construction, viz. that *the beasts* or *Cherubim* did not themselves utter the words of the *new Song*, but only that they *fell down before the Lamb*, while the *new Song* was sung by the *four and twenty Elders*, and that they said *Amen* at the conclusion.—

But were this construction right (which I think it is not, with all the advantages the author strives to give it) yet would not the intended consequence be admitted: for to *fall down* before a proper object of worship,

ship, and to join in assent to words of adoration addressed by other worshippers to that object, is still worship to all intents and purposes, and worship in every part of the address made use of.

THE same author in his *answer to the Mod. Apology*, p. 42. where this objection from worship is considered, says,—“ If “ the Cherubim, as according to Mr H. are “ representatives of *Jehovah*, the Persons “ in the Covenant, can it be any objection “ to his explanation, or rather is it not a “ strong confirmation of it, that they do “ and say what was to be said and done in “ consequence of the Covenant?”

YES, it is an objection to his explanation, that they should say or do, what was to be said or done *only* by others in consequence of the Covenant. All creatures were to join in ascribing glory and honour, and in giving of thanks to the Lamb, and to worship the Lamb, in consequence of the power that was given him by virtue of the Covenant. But the *Creators themselves*, the original Covenanters, could have no part in this adoration. And till this Gentleman can shew, that the worship of the Lamb by all the Divine Persons

was

346 DISCOURSE II.

was a consequence of the original Covenant among themselves, his observations here will have no weight.

HE offers another proof of the beasts not uttering the words of the *New Song*, viz. because it seems absurd, that the lyon should say, *Thou hast redeemed us*. For, says he, "The lyon is made to represent "Christ by commentators and by the text; "chap. v. 5. So, if *thou hast redeemed us*, "were spoken by the beast, then the lyon "was redeemed by the Lamb." He adds, "I hope they who make the objection I "am speaking to, will tell us how that "could be." *Examiner Examined*, note at p. 81.

THE objectors, I presume, would tell him, if they thought this needed any answer, that they were not obliged to clear up any difficulties that arose merely from Mr H. and his own hypothesis, as this manifestly does.—That he takes for granted the lyon in the *Cberubim* is the representative of the second Person in the Trinity.—That on such supposition, the lyon being redeemed by the Lamb, could not be explained any more than the lyon's worshipping the Lamb.—That both of them

them are absurdities equally consequent on his exposition of the *Cherubim*.

FURTHER they might say, that *the lion* he refers to as mentioned, chap. v. 5. and made by Commentators and by the text to represent Christ, is the *lion of Judah*, which prevailed to open the seals, and which was worshipped by the lion in the *Cherubim*. And consequently, that the lion in the *Cherubim* must represent some person, or order and character of persons, who were redeemed by the Lamb; under which exposition, neither the song nor the adoration of the lion in the *Cherubim* will appear absurd, or difficult to be accounted for.

I HAVE spoken more particularly to the pretended illustrations of the matter by this author, because he is pleased to say in p. 42. of the *Defence of the Plan*, that the objections mentioned in the *Mod. Apology*, viz. "That the Cherubim cry
"Holy, Holy, Holy, give thanks to, and
"fall down before the Lamb, and the
"like, have been made twice in print
"before, and the answers stand unanswer-
"ed yet."

WHETHER

348 DISCOURSE II.

WHETHER what has been now said may pass for an answer I leave to the reader.

I DO not, I dare not, undertake to expound, or give the meaning of these mysterious scenes in St *John's* visions. They are of too abstruse a nature, I conceive, to be fully and certainly explained in all their parts. But, I apprehend, thus much may be justly concluded from them, *viz.* First, from the position of the man and lyon in these visions, that those figures were not the emblems of the two natures in Christ; and consequently that the same figures in *Ezekiel's* visions, though placed next to each other, were not emblems of those natures, as is suggested. Secondly, that St *John's* ζωα, each with one face, and having it's animal form distinct from the rest, are not the same with *Ezekiel's* רימות each of which had four faces or visages belonging to one head. And if *Ezekiel's* *Cberubim*, each with four faces, were proper representatives of the Trinity, St *John's* *Cberubim* being four, with each one face, were not. And thirdly from the worship ascribed to all the four beasts, (in so strong a manner that the description cannot be disguised

disguised by any art, nor the idea of proper adoration thrown out of sight) that the said beasts in the Revelations are not emblems of the Persons in the Deity.

I SHALL conclude this article with considering a remark of *Examiner Examined*, in the abovementioned note at p. 80. where he says

“ A N objection hath been formed by
“ some who will begin at the wrong end,
“ can read Greek, but not Hebrew, and
“ much triumphed upon, as if the *Che-*
“ *rubim* were not the representatives of the
“ the Persons of the Trinity, because they
“ *paid homage to the Lamb*. I hope that is
“ cleared.”

HE should have said, because they *wor-*
shipped the Lamb, (for that is the sense of
the original) and then it cannot be cleared.

BUT the original is *only Greek*, as if
that language was not as intelligible as the
Hebrew. And the objection comes from
persons who cannot read *Hebrew*, as if the
Greek Testament could not be understood
in words of common use and occurrence,
such as *πρω*, and *προσκυνω*, by any one
who is no a master of *Hebrew*. Or as if
the *Hebrew* words which are commonly
rendered

350 DISCOURSE II.

rendered by those Greek words in the LXX viz. נפל and שחז in *Hithpabel* did not signify *to worship*, but *to do homage*. What advantage hath the learned Author of *Elibu* made of his skill in *Hebrew*, in the experiment he tried upon קרד, as the root that ought to govern the sense of ἐπεσον in the fifth of Revelations? Mr H. seems in this respect to have been of a different sentiment from both these Gentlemen, for he apprehends the *Hieroglyphical Scenes* in the *Revelations* may be described in any language,* and were writ for the use of such as did not understand *Hebrew*, but were used to Hieroglyphics.

BUT

* *Remarks*, p. 396. “ As Hieroglyphics were framed and instituted at first for men who had not been taught languages and sciences, and were a species of evidence, which gives the strongest ideas and which might be described in any language; so at last the *Apocalypse* seems to have been writ in that manner, for the better information of those who had been used to them, and who had these sorts of Hieroglyphics preserved and standing, but did not understand the *Hebrew language*: So for any that should afterwards acquire the understanding of either or both, the one being the images of the things, the other the words for them. So we find in the *Apocalypse* which is most of it writ in this manner,” &c.

BUT they who can read *Greek* and not *Hebrew*, and who interpret the *Apocalypse* by the knowledge of *Greek only*, are represented as *beginning at the wrong end*. Upon which I would observe,

FIRST, that if Mr *H.* and his followers had *begun* their exposition of the *Cherubim* with the consideration of this exhibition of them in St *John's* *visions*, explained by his *Greek original*, they had in one sense, begun at the *right end*. For in that case they could never have been induced *so* to expound the *Cherubim* in *Genesis*, as to make them irreconcilable with *Cherubim* in the *Revelations*.

AND secondly, that although the knowledge of the *Hebrew* is in many respects desirable, and useful, yet if it be misapplied, or fancifully used, it may sometimes draw a man into weak arguments, and lead him to false conclusions. Some instances of this have been already given, and more will be added hereafter, when I come to consider the use that has been made, by some reputed adepts in the *Hebrew* tongue, of this notion, *viz.* that the writers of the New Testament have delivered the sense of *Hebrew* words, by *Greek* words,

352 DISCOURSE II.

words, which if interpreted as Greek, carry quite another signification. At present I shall only subjoin two instances, that occur in Mr H.'s exposition of *the visions* we have been considering.

REV. vi. 1. *When the Lamb opened one of the seals, I heard as it were the noise of Thunder* (ως φωνὴ βροντῆς) *one of the four beasts saying, Come and see.*

BUT Thunder, (which is in Hebrew קול רעם and sometimes expressed by קול רעם *Vox tonitru*. Psal. lxxvii. 19. the φωνὴ βροντῆς of St John) being sometimes expressed in the Old Testament, as in Psal. lxxix. Job. xxxvii. by קול יהוה the *voice of the Lord*; Mr H. thinks he has warrant to expound St John's *noise of Thunder*, by the *voice of God*. *Remarks*, p. 400. From which the inference will seem to be, that the *beast* which spoke *with the similitude of God's voice*, was a true representative of a Divine Person.

AGAIN. In the next page of *Remarks*, p. 401. He cites Rev. xv. 7. "*One of the four beasts gave unto the seven Angels* (τοῖς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλοις) *seven golden vials.*"

Now

Now the Hebrew word for $\epsilon\pi\lambda$ is שבע. And there is another word of the same Hebrew letters which signifies *saturitas, satietas, quod sufficit*. Also the Hebrew word for $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is מלאך, which under the prefix מ signifies, according to Mr H. *an instrument, an agent*. Therefore he will not have τοις $\epsilon\pi\lambda$ $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ to signify, as translated in our Bible, *the seven angels*, but to mean *a sufficient number of agents*. Which instance alone may shew how possible it is for a man to be so enamoured with *Hebrew diction*, as to forget the common proprieties of other languages; or be so attached to *Hebrew Originals and Etymologies*, as to overlook the meaning of *one, two, three*, in other tongues.

THOUGH $\epsilon\pi\lambda$ should be supposed to stand in other places for שבע in the sense of *sufficient*, it cannot do so in this place, because *these Angels* are recounted in the next chapter in their order $\delta\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$, &c. down to $\delta\ \epsilon\delta\omicron\delta\epsilon\mu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, v. 17. each of them *pouring out his vial*, &c. The article τοις likewise forbids the understanding $\epsilon\pi\lambda$ of *a sufficient number*; which translation would run as uncouthly here, as the following version of $\text{Αν } \epsilon\pi\lambda\alpha \text{ πληγαι των}$

A a

$\epsilon\pi\lambda\alpha$

354 DISCOURSE II.

ἐπὶ τὰ Ἀγγέλων, would in the next verse. viz.

“ And no man was able to enter into the
“ temple, till *a sufficient number of plagues*
“ of a *sufficient number of agents* were ful-
“ filled.”

I COME lastly, to the only text in the New Testament where *the word Cherubim* occurs, viz. *Heb. ix. 5. Cherubim of Glory*, cited by Mr C. p. 15. And as it neither makes for or against their construction in any respect, *save one*, I shall consider it in that *one* light only, viz. as the *sole* passage in the whole record of the Revelation by *Jesus Christ*, where the *word itself* is found, and found also without any explanation; which is a very strong evidence, that the knowledge of the *Cherubim*, according to Mr H.'s conception and construction of them, is not of that importance to Christianity that he avers it to be. *Glor. and Grav. p. 48.*

“ As this is the most glorious subject
“ that ever man has writ upon, as it leads
“ one to the most glorious, most desirable
“ discovery, or recovery of what has been
“ designedly concealed by our enemies that
“ ever man made; as it brings the first,
“ or eldest action that ever was revealed to

“ man,

upon CHERUBIM. 355

“ man, and the only secret which he is
 “ concerned to know hieroglyphically to
 “ sense; that which was to keep the very
 “ way to the tree of life; the evidence of
 “ the foundation of the Christian System,
 “ of the Trinity; of making the Cove-
 “ nant for the redemption of men; of
 “ taking the man into the Essence; of
 “ the commemorating of the Covenant,
 “ and typically of the manner of per-
 “ forming it; of exhibiting it above as a
 “ propitiation for men; which seems to
 “ have been reserved to a very proper
 “ time.” &c.

IF it be asked how the Christian world came to be deprived so long of this knowledge, this evidence of the foundation of their Religion, the Trinity, it is answered, the apostate Jews industriously hid it from them.—*Josephus* speaks “ of the *Cberu-*
 “ *bim*, but will not own that he knew
 “ their figures *.—— The Rabbies give

A a 2

“ different

* He owned all that he knew about them, if any credit may be given to his own words, saying in one place *Zwa d' esi weleiva*, &c. “ that they were in form unlike what-
 “ ever had been seen by men.” And in another place, viz. *lib. viii. c. 11.* “ That nobody could say, or con-
 “ jecture of what form they were.” Now though *Jose-*
phus

356 DISCOURSE II.

“different accounts of them, but none
“tell the truth.” (A proof, I presume,
that they knew not the truth of this mat-
ter)—That it concerned them to conceal
it from the Christians; who by this means
were kept in ignorance of this grand point
in their Religion, *the Christian Covenant in
hieroglyphics.*

YET nevertheless we may justly won-
der, if this really was the case, that no
provisions were made in the New Testa-
ment to prevent the Church of Christ be-
ing brought into this deplorable situation.
For however *Josephus* and others might
not own what they knew, but endeavour
to stifle and hide this important secret
from the true heirs of it; yet how can
we believe our blessed Lord and his Apo-
stles should so far neglect our interest in
it, as to omit our instruction in this point
entirely, by not expounding to us, at any
time, what their and our enemies so in-
dustriously kept out of sight then, and
were determined to hide, if possible, for
ever! How comes it to pass that *St Paul*,
who

phus says, that none knew them, or could make any good
guess about them, yet *Mr H.* will have it that he concealed
what he knew himself.

upon *CHERUBIM*. 357

who must have known the *Cherubim*, it may be presumed, as well as *Josephus* could, when speaking of them, *should not own that he knew* their figure, or their meaning; especially when he was discoursing on the typical relation of the *most holy Place* to the *Heavens*, where Christ hath entered as our Mediator; and yet in mentioning them as part of the furniture of that most sacred place, he appears to speak with as much indifference; or with as little seeming consciousness of the mystery in them, as he doth of *Aaron's Rod*, or the *Pot of Manna*; saying of them οὐκ ἐστὶν οὐδὲ λέγειν κατὰ μέτρον. Whereas, if Mr H.'s account be right, nothing could have been more proper, or more needful, for him to have illustrated and enlarged upon than this fundamental article, "*Cor & medulla*, "of all religion;" in order to prevent it's being secreted from the Christians by the unbelieving Jews. But as he hath not done this, nor any other writer of the Old or New Testament hath at any time thought fit to describe particularly the *Cherubim* on the Mercy-Seat; I must choose (myself) to abide by the sentiment

358 DISCOURSE II.

of *Hadrian Reland* concerning them, viz.
 “Non dubito, si sacri Scriptores voluif-
 “sent nos magis accuratam habere formæ
 “Cherubinorum notitiam, quin clarius &
 “copioſius deſcripturi fuiſſent.”

De locis Sacris, p. 51.

DISCOURSE

DISCOURSE III.

U P O N

CHERUBIM.

SECT. I.

Cherubim understood by the Christian Church of *Angels*.

I HAVE in the two former Discourses, to the best of my ability, considered the principal points whereby Mr *H.*'s explication of the *Cherubim* is distinguished from all others, and which are the chief things insisted upon by Mr *C.* not only as happily discovered, but as made quite clear and plain to the intelligent reader.

AND to such reader I do submit all that I have said in the first Discourse, to shew

360 DISCOURSE III.

that this hypothesis is built upon exceptionable grounds; and *in the Second*, that this exposition is not rightly reconcileable with several of the texts of Scripture that are produced to confirm it. In which, if I shall be thought to have succeeded well for the most part, though perhaps not to full satisfaction in every particular, it will nevertheless, I presume, render all further enquiries into Mr *H.*'s other collateral surmises on the subject, unnecessary. For there are several passages of smaller moment, though immediately relative to this subject, several incidental observations upon, or references to his own doctrine of the *Cberubim* scattered throughout his Works, which I have taken no notice of: partly because they seem to have been merely his private opinion, without pretence of Scripture authority for it, and which I judge will have no weight, if the main branches of the hypothesis, said to be grounded on Scripture, are found to have none: and partly because some of them, though given under colour of being authorized by Scripture, are nevertheless so briefly, or so obscurely expressed, that I am not able to say I comprehend
his

his meaning in them ; and am therefore obliged to leave them to persons of greater sagacity and penetration.

I SHOULD be sorry to have it shewn, that I have any where misrepresented him : though I can easily foresee it will be said I have done so often. But though I can answer that I have not done it at any time with design, yet I must not be sure that I have not mistaken *his meaning* in some expressions where I fancied myself secure of it. I must likewise intreat my reader, if he thinks I have in any part of the foregoing Dissertations transgressed the limits of a just enquiry, or have abused the pretence of a fair examiner, or have expressed the difference of my sentiments in any point from those I differ from, in a stronger manner than was needful for shewing *that* difference ; or have laid greater stress on the reasons given in support of my sentiments than their own weight and force will warrant ; in a word, if he thinks I seem any where to take upon me the part of a *censurer* or *teacher*, rather than of a diligent enquirer into the merits of the subject—that in any of these cases he will be so good as to impute such defects

362 DISCOURSE III.

fects to a frailty, which I have more cause to be concerned at myself, than he can have to be offended with.

I MEET with a saying of Mr *H.*'s (*Rel. of Satan*, p. 112.) which I shall beg leave to adopt and repeat as my own, viz. "I desire nothing of any man but that he may see for himself, and weigh the evidence I offer with what has been lately offered by others."

To which I shall subjoin another saying equally ingenuous, which I borrow out of his *Preface*, to the second part of *Data*, &c. viz. "I desire you not to trust me in any point, but desire you only to study the Original Scriptures."

IN points that are difficult and obscure, we must patiently hear and bear with one another. In places that fairly admit of a latitude, and variety of interpretation, we should allow every man his option in that variety; which allowance should, in all reason, oblige him to let others enjoy the same favour. And I do not know a Scripture Subject where this liberty may be more inoffensively claimed, or more safely granted than in this of the Cherubim

rubim *, more particularly that branch of it, which relates to *Ezekiel's* visions, about which there are no conjectures but what have their difficulties and embarrassments: yet none of them have been otherwise than well received, when they have been modestly propounded; when no singular stress has been laid upon them, and nobody *required* to maintain them, or to acquiesce in them *exclusive* of all other expositions.

THE interpreters, indeed, agree better in their opinion about the *Cherubim* at Paradise, and the images called by that name in the Tabernacle and Temple: for as Mr C. truly observes, "It has been a notion almost universally received, that the *Cherubim* were created spirits," (Serm. p. 12.) viz. those at Paradise. And it is as generally held, that the golden *Cherubim* in the most holy place of the Tabernacle, were material representations or emblems of Angels or ministering Spirits. And though it cannot be said that this notion

* "De Cheruborum origine, figurâ, institutionis ratione, & propriâ vocis significatione, prolixæ Eruditorum Dissertatione, & variæ prostant conjecturæ." *Deyling. Obser. Sacr.* Part II. p. 443.

364 DISCOURSE III.

notion will be found altogether without it's difficulties, when one comes to support it from Scripture Evidence, because such emblematical design is not directly taught or explained in Scripture; yet it will be found, perhaps, less liable to exceptions upon the whole, than any other account of these material figures that has been hitherto offered.

AND whereas Mr *H.* and his followers have thought fit to treat this opinion of the *Cherubim* being, or representing angels, with a good deal of contempt *, (I am

* "So reading the translations we had from the apostate Jews, and the Jewish forgeries making the *Cherubim* Angels, making the figures to represent them in the likeness of men, and the operations of the *Angels* in this system in the religion they forged in *Persia*, in their forgery of the *Alcoran*, in those legends of lies the Rabbinical books," &c. *Power Essential*, p. 107.

"From whence may be demonstrated the silliness and falshood of the Jewish stories about *Angels*," &c. *Elibu*, p. 21.

"There is no room for Rabbinical tales about *Angels*." *Prel. Disc.* p. 55.

"In *Genesis* the *Cherubim* are *Angels* in Person. In *Exodus* they are men. In *Ezekiel* they are beasts, and stand for *Angels*."

"What is this?" *Def. of the Plan.* p. 51.

"The setting up *Angels* as centinels round an apple-tree in *Paradise*," &c. p. 5. They have made the *Cherubim* a scare crow.

am sorry to say so, but some of them might think themselves misrepresented if I should use a softer expression) it may not be unacceptable to my reader, that I should speak a little more particularly to their objections against it, and examine what real weight there may be in them; whether any thing is offered that doth apparently overthrow the current and long established opinion concerning the *Cberubim*, or doth so materially affect it, as that it cannot stand it's ground and maintain it's credit, as formerly, among Christians. There is a further reason too for making this enquiry, and that is, the adoption of this opinion from the primitive times in the Liturgic Offices of the Church*. And our Church in particular, in conformity with the Catholick, hath not scrupled to use in her public Service an ancient Christian Hymn in which *Cberubim* occurs, in the sense (as has been generally thought) of Angels or ministring Spirits.

IT

* In the morning Hymn beginning with Δοξα εν υψι-
 σσι there is mention of *Cberubim*, Προσδεξαι την δην-
 σιν ημων ο καθημεν εν επι των χειρουριμ. *Apost. Const.*
lib. vii. c. 47. As also in all the several Greek Liturgies
 ascribed to *St James*, *St Peter*, *St Mark*, *St Basil*, *St Gre-*
gory, *St Chrysostom*, &c.

366 DISCOURSE III.

IT is, indeed, pretended now, that if *Cberubim* in the *Te Deum* hath been commonly so understood, it was through mistake, and by a vulgar error, for by *Cberubim* and *Seraphim* in that Hymn, we ought to understand the Persons of the Blessed Trinity.

WE are told by the learned author of *Elibu*, in a note added to the *Prel. Disc.* p. 54. "That the person or persons who composed this Hymn seem plainly to have taken this part from the Scriptures, —and by *Cberubim* and *Seraphim* to have meant Beings above all created intelligences.—For the former clause comprehends the whole Celestial Hierarchy and Chorus, however dignified or distinguished, *To thee all Angels cry aloud, the Heavens, and all the Powers therein.* To compleat the praises of the Deity or Trinity in Unity, the blessed Three, the *Cberubim* and *Seraphim* proclaim his Glory."

How far this exposition may tend to relieve the minds of those who embrace Mr H.'s doctrine of the *Cberubim*, by an appearance (though a very slight one) of reconciling it to an expression in the daily Service,

upon *CHERUBIM*. 367

Service, which in it's natural and obvious acceptation does manifestly exclude it, I cannot tell; but that it should really be imagined to have been the design of the composer or composers of this ancient Hymn, to introduce the Persons in the Godhead, crying out to each other, *Holy*, &c. under the title of *Cherubim* and *Seraphim*, is, to my thinking at least, something very unaccountable.

IN the *Trisagion*, or *Cherubical Hymn*, as it was called by the Ancients, and is yet retained in our Communion Office, the words are, "*With Angels and Archangels, and all the Company of Heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name, evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, Heaven and earth are full of thy Glory.*"

IN this most ancient and celebrated Doxology, (for the antiquity of it see *Bingham*, Vol. V. B. xiii. ch. 6.) we find the *τρισάγιον* ascribed to *angels*: as their manner of praising the Blessed Trinity: and by this Hymn being denominated *Cherubic*, and by it's being taken immediately from the *Seraphic Hymn*, *Isa. vi. 3.* the *Cherubic Hymn*, *Rev. iv. 8.* and the Angelick

368 DISCOURSE III.

gelick Hymn, *Luke ii. 14.* it is evident the first Christians held the *Seraphim* and *Cherubim* to be *Angels*, or *created Intelligences*. It doth no where appear that they were ever otherwise interpreted in the succeeding Ages of the Church. And it must be esteemed one of the most improbable conjectures, to suppose that *St Ambrose*, or whoever was the author of *Te Deum*, should intend to ascribe, under the names of *Cherubim* and *Seraphim*, to the Blessed Trinity, words of Doxology, which the Catholick Church had always understood as spoken by *Angels and Archangels*.

BESIDES, as *Seraphim* denotes, according to our author, the Trinity, as well as the *Cherubim*, and as the compilers of this Hymn are represented by him as thinking so too, is it not strange that they should have put them both in, when either of them singly would have been sufficient?

HE could imagine he saw some unaccountable tautology in bringing in the *Cherubim* and *Seraphim* as *Angels*, or heavenly Powers, after mention had been already made of *All Angels*, and of *All the Powers*

in

in Heaven, though the meaning seems obvious, *i. e.* even the highest of those Powers, Cherubim and Seraphim. But he seems to perceive none in the mention of the Trinity by two several and distinct names.

I WOULD only further ask, with what propriety the *Seraphim* in *Isaiah*, or the *Cherubim* in the *Revelations*, (from whence the words of this Doxology are taken) could praise the Trinity in Unity, (that is, according to this exposition, praise themselves) in the third Person? One cried to another, in *Isaiah*, *זֶה אֱלֹהֵינוּ*—the Earth is full of *His* Glory *כְּבוֹדוֹ*. *וְעַתָּה, וְעַתָּה, וְעַתָּה*, *Revelations*. Or address him, *i. e.* themselves, in the *Te Deum*, in the second Person, *To thee* Cherubim, &c. Heaven and Earth are full of *Thy* Glory? Or lastly, With what propriety *the blessed Three* could be joined with the creatures, *however dignified or distinguished*, in an address of Praise to the Deity? Could *the person or persons who composed this Hymn*, have intended to make a transition from the Praises of the Angelick Hosts to those of Men, Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, &c. by an immediate

B b

insertion

370 DISCOURSE III.

insertion of a proclamation of Glory given by the Divine Persons to themselves?

THE compilers of our Liturgy by saying, not THE *Cherubim* and *Seraphim*, but indeterminately *Cherubin* and *Seraphin*, have shewn that they understood by these words, not the Persons of the Trinity, or emblems of them, but an uncertain number of other Beings, which last was the general sense of *their*, as well as former times. And therefore our author's suggestion in a note, at p. 62. of the *Prel. Disc.* * that they favoured his notion of the Cherubim, by ordering the ivth chapter of *Revelations* to be the Epistle for Trinity Sunday, cannot be admitted: but may, however, be more particularly answered. This had been once before hinted in the proposals for publishing Mr H.'s Works, and supported by the *Defender of his Plan*, in his way, against the *Modest Apologist*.

* " I have the satisfaction to find, that the compilers of
 " our Liturgy seem to have had the *same sense* of the *true*
 " interpretation of the ivth chapter of the *Revelations*, as
 " is above given, by ordering it to be read for the Epistle
 " upon Trinity Sunday, which, I presume, was done from
 " their opinion of the persons concerned in celebrating the
 " Hymn therein set down, as well as their sense and inter-
 " pretation of the Hymn itself."

Apologist. (*Mod. Apol.* p. 22. *Defence*, p. 42.) But is not the *Trisagion* alone, which is a part of this portion of Scripture, an obvious and sufficient reason for the appointment of this chapter as the Epistle for Trinity Sunday, without looking further into the compilers sentiments, and presuming it was done from their opinion of the persons concerned in the Hymn, as well as their opinion of the Hymn itself? To presume this, is much the same kind of compliment paid to their judgment, as if it had been said, that they approved of the use of the *Te Deum*, because they had the *same sense of the true interpretation of Cherubim and Seraphim*, which the composers of it had, (*viz.* that they meant the Blessed Trinity) as well as because they approved of the Hymn itself.

WE may *safely venture*, as far as I can find, to *believe* any thing that makes for Mr H—'s discoveries, provided *we dare not* to doubt of them.

372 DISCOURSE III.

S E C T. II.

Texts of Scripture examined.

TO return to Mr C. who having allowed the notion of *Cherubim* signifying Angels, to have been almost universally received, is pleased to add—"For which there is not one word of proof in the Scripture." *Serm.* p. 12. Which he repeats in his *Answer to Mr B.* and again in his *State of the Case*, p. 7. but in terms more cautiously put together, viz. that "*not one text* could be produced, from whence it could be *proved*, that by *Cherubim* are meant *an Order of Angels.*"—How far *any one text* will go towards *proving* them an Order of Angels, I cannot say: But there are texts wherein they are distinguished, both by name and description, from *Seraphim*; who are mentioned also, as being near the Throne of
God,

God, and as far as can be gathered from the short account given of them by *Isaiah*, chap. vi. were *Satellites*, in the posture of service attending their Lord and Master. And there are texts, even in the Old Testament, though more in the New, which express the existence and use of Angels, and the innumerable Hosts of them, without specifying their orders or their names. As *Dan. vii. 10.* *Thousand thousands ministered unto him.* *1 Kings xxii. 19.* *I saw the Lord sitting on his Throne, and all the Host * of Heaven standing by him on the*

B b 3

Right-

* On this text *Eusebius* notes, Δια μεν τς αριθμς συνλων το τω Θεω καλαηπτον αυτων, δια δε τς ποσς το ημιν απειργον. *Præp. Evang.* Properly the stars are the Host of Heaven, as *Jer. xxxiii. 22.* As the Host of Heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured, &c. The Hebrew is צבא השמים. which compared with the parallel texts, *Gen. xv. 5.* and *xxii. 17.* will be the same with כוכבי השמים. And these were Στρατια τς Ουρανς, where *St Stephen*, interpreted by *St Luke* says, God gave them up to worship the Host of Heaven. *Acts vii. 42.*

But in the symbolical language, as in this text above cited out of *1 Kings*, כל צבא השמים, signifies the Angels: like Στρατια Ουρανιος, *Luke ii. 13.* there appeared with the Angel a multitude of the Heavenly Host, praising God, and saying. Angels are represented as the Armies of Heaven, Στρατευματα εν τω ουρανω. *Rev. xix. 14.*—Pray to my Father, and he will give me more than twelve Legions

374 DISCOURSE III.

right-hand, and on the left. And several persons, writing professedly on the subject, have shewed, by a collation of texts in the Old and New Testament, with each other, that angels or ministring spirits were employed in the publication of the Law at *Mount Sinai*: and have very rationally inferred from thence, that the material *Che-
rubim* in the Tabernacle and Temple were designed to be memorials of that ministration. The proofs of their ministring at *Sinai* are, if I mistake not, too express to be evaded by Mr *H.*'s different interpretation of the texts that are adduced. And though the inference concerning *the Memorials* in the Tabernacle, &c. be not quite so well supported from Scripture, yet it will appear to have a reasonable foundation, as a probable inference, though it cannot be expressly proved by any Scripture Authority.

THE

Legions of Angels, *Matt.* xxvi. 53. viz. a compleat Host; for 12 Legions, says *Grotius*, made *justum exercitum* among the *Romans*. See *Matt.* xxiv. 30. *Mark* xiii. 26. and xiv. 62. and viii. 38. *Luke* xxi. 27. &c. *Daubuz* on *Revelations*, p. 483.—*Joh. Leusden*, *Philol. Heb. Græc.* Diff. 14. p. 112.

See also (and compare this note with it) a chapter of Mr *H.* in his *Trinity of the Gentiles*, under the title of אלהים כל צבא השמים.

THE texts for the ministration of angels at *Mount Sinai* in the Old Testament, are *Deut.* xxxiii. 2. and *Psalms* lxxviii. 17. In the New Testament, they are *Acts* vii. 53. and *Gal.* iii. 19. Let us consider and compare them, and also Mr H.'s account of them as we go along.

DEUT. xxxiii. 2. "The Lord came
" from *Sinai*, and rose up from *Seir* unto
" them. He shined forth from Mount
" *Paran*, and he came *with ten thousands*
" of *Saints*; (*Marg.* Holy Myriads) from
" his right-hand went a fiery Law for
" them." (*Marg.* A fire of Law.)

MR H. in order to put this passage into quite another dress, introduces it with a preamble, containing a piece of History, for which he gives no authority, and by which he would have the text interpreted, His words, in his own edition of his *Remarks*, p. 84. are as follow.

" As *Job*, chap. xix. desired earnestly
" that what was revealed to him concern-
" ing the coming of אלה might be re-
" corded for ever; so *Moses*, *Deut.* xxxiii.
" performed *Job's* wish, recorded it, and
" called it *the Blessing* with which *Moses*,
" the Man of the *Elabim*, blest the Chil-

376 DISCOURSE III.

“dren of *Israel* at the point of Death,
 “*Moses* describes his typical coming, which
 “was, though a shadow, a sure pledge of
 “his real coming, as the cutting off the
 “typical *Berith*, and the Law of fire there
 “for them was of his suffering the Wrath,
 “and of his being really cut off for all,
 “so speaks in the past tense, as the other
 “Prophets did of visions they had seen of
 “these things.

“ET dixit, Jehovah de סני (the mount
 “of the *Elabim*) venit. (Brix. סנה מנדרול
 “and סין Heliopolis.) Et ortus est משער
 “from the place of judgment, (with the
 “Jod) eis eluxit è monte, פארן the Glory,
 “& venit à רבבת the Majesty of the
 “Holy, à dextra ejus; ignis lex eis.” &c.

Now passing over many disputable things that are inserted in this version, and in the previous comment to it, I shall at present look no further than to his own rendering of the word רבבת, on which the whole stress lies with respect to the point, for which I have cited the text.

HE translates it—*the Majesty* *, without

* The editors (or he who had the care of the press, and of the translations) in the new edition of his Works,
 (p. 351.

out giving the least intimation by what authority he fixes that sense upon it, so different from it's usual and invariable signification in the Hebrew Scriptures. For רבבה sing. and רבבות (and wrote without the *Vau* רבבת) plur. signifying μυριας and μυριαδες, occur at least a dozen times, and never with any other construction, if any dependance may be had on the agreement of all the versions, or the obvious sense of the texts themselves, not to add further confirmations

(p. 351. of the VIth Volume) have thought proper to omit the Hebrew word entirely, and so to leave the original Word for *Majesty*, which they retain, to the guess or imagination of the reader.

They have likewise omitted to translate the last words of the citation, *Ignis lex eis*; whereby the reference of this passage to the giving of the Law at *Sinai*, is kept something more out of sight. They have also put the verbs in the *present tense*—*Jehovah cometh, ariseth, shineth, &c.* which both in the Hebrew, and in the version used by Mr H. run in the *past tense*, (Mr H. himself offering a reason why they were in the perfect, not the present tense) which still lessens the appearance of the text having any relation to the ministration of Angels at the promulgation of the *Mosaical Law*.

I do not say, that they did *design* by this to disguise the passage; but whatever was their intention in making these further alterations in a text that Mr H. had already put into a novel dress, the fact is, that their version doth *not speak the sense* of the Original near so much as *his doth*, by reason of their having altered the tenses of the verbs.

378 DISCOURSE III.

confirmations where it is so needless. Nor is there any thing incongruous in the application of the word to *Angels*. *Targ.* on the text, expounds it by *Myriades Angelorum Sanctorum*. We also meet with the phrase in *Heb.* xii. 22. *Μυριασιν Αγγελων.* And *Jude* 14. where the expression is more similar to this in *Deuteronomy*, viz. *ηλθε Κυριος εν μυριασιν Αγiais αυτου.*

THE other text, out of the Old Testament, proposed to be examined, is *Psalms* lxxviii. 17. of which our English version is,

“THE Chariots of God are Twenty
“Thousand, even Thousands of Angels,
“the Lord is among them, as in *Sinai*, in
“the Holy Place.”

HEBREW, רכב אלהים (the chariots of God *) רבותים, if plural, *many Myriads* †: If dual, as commonly interpreted, two Myriads ‡, or twenty thousand,

* *Equitatus. La Chevalerie.* The Chariots which form the Armies of God; as in *Isa.* xxi. 7.—xxii. 6, 7.

† Το αρμα τε Θες μυριο πλαιοιον. LXX. “*Currus Dei decies mille multiplicatus.*” *Novatian.* “*Decies millecuplex. i. e. multa millia Angelorum.*” *Genebrard.*

‡ *Targ.* “*Currus Dei sunt תרין רבבן, duæ myriades ignis ardentis quos duo millia Angelorum.*” &c.—

“*Curruum*

stand, as our English version gives it.

אלפי שנים. *Millia iterationis*. In pairs. *marg.* of the *English Bible*, *Thousands of doubling, or double ones*. If meant of doubling properly, that is, of one repetition, it gives the sense of the *Targ. duo millia Angelorum*. But if meant of doubling repeated, it gives the sense of our marginal version, *even many thousands*, and that of *Grot. Millia plurima*: as *Χιλιάδες, Χιλιάδων, Rev. v. 11*.

BUT that Angels are meant, whatever were the numbers specified in the text, or whatever account ought to be given of the word שנים, which, I think, occurs here only, is agreed by most who have commented on the place *.

THE Lord is among them, &c. אדני במ סיני נקדש. The LXX have it *Kyrios en autois, en tw Sinai, en tw Agiō*. Whence some

"Curruum Dei duæ sunt myriades, & millia plurima. viz. Angelos comparat exercitui. Unus erat Angelus Deum referens & multi aderant Stipatores." *Grotius*.

"Quod autem duas tantum myriades nominat tantundem valet locutio, ac si diceret præsto esse ingentes exercitus in Sanctuario." *Calvinus*.

* LXX have rendered it by *Χιλιάδες ευθυνητων*. *Vulg.* by *Millia lætantium*. R. Sol. מלאכי. Chald. אַנְגֵּלִי. Vide *Amamam* in locum.

380 DISCOURSE III.

some have imagined the Hebrew was wrote בכני. See Bishop *Hare* on the text; who conjectures also, that *bekodesh* should be read *bekadesh*, in *Kadesh*. Which, though I mention, I cannot much approve.

BUT as קדש is by most interpreters understood of the Sanctuary, therefore some of them construe the text of God's Presence in the Sanctuary, or the Holy Place, in like manner as he had been formerly present at Mount Sinai *: which construction is followed, as it seems, by our translators. But the closest version, and to my thinking the least exceptionable, is that of those who construe *Sinai bekodesh* together, viz. *Sinai* is in the Sanctuary †.

MR *H.*'s exposition of this text is as follows. "רכב the *drivers* of the *Aleim* are many millions. The Lord is on them in Sinai, in the Holy Place." *Mos. Princ.* p. 295.

WHERE

* "Dominus *Sinai* in Sanctuario habitans." *Junius*.
 "Cum quibus ipse Dominus *sicut* olim in *Sinai*, (Eclipsis " כ notæ similitudinis) *ita* in suo Sanctuario." *Genebrard*.
 † "Affirmet *Psaltes Sinai* fuisse in Sanctuario." *Deylingius*. "Emphatice dicitur *Sinai* esse in Sanctuario." *Lud. de Dieu*. "Sinai which is now in the Sanctuary." *Patrick*.

upon CHERUBIM. 381

WHERE he further explains *Drivers* by two texts. One of them is the 4th verse of this *Psal.* “Extol him that *rideth* “*upon the Heavens.*” Hebr. רכב בערבות. This he renders, “Extol him that *rules* “*over the Mixtures.* (Mixers, the Mixture “of Light and Grains).”

THE other is *Psal.* civ. 3. “Who “maketh the Clouds his Chariot.” Heb. השם עבים רכבו. And this he translates, “Who makes *the Densities his Drivers.*”

So that by interpreting רכב *Drivers*, and by producing another text to shew that these *Drivers* were *Densities*, he seems, to himself, to have rid his hands of the Ministry of Angels at *Sinai*, from this text, as he had done from the former, by his Comment on *Job*’s wish. How he hath, indeed, succeeded in either attempt, I think may be safely left to the reader’s judgment.

LET us see in the next place, how he avoids the texts in the New Testament, which are cited to the same purpose, viz. the Ministration of Angels at *Sinai*.

ACTS vii. 53. Who have received the Law *by the disposition of Angels:* εἰς διαταγὰς Ἀγγέλων.

THIS

382 DISCOURSE III.

THIS he renders by *the disposition of the Aleim*. *Power Essential*, p. 107. He owns, indeed, that *the Greek* is *Angels*; but says, “the Greek hath no expressive word for *Aleim*, but frequently uses “*Angels*, that is, Agents.” *ibid*.

BUT whether the Greek hath an expressive word for *Aleim*, in Mr H.’s sense or not (though I should think *εὐαγγέλιον* is as expressive in Greek, as his word *Fæderatores* in Latin,) it is plain, nevertheless, both the LXX, and the writers of the New Testament had a word, viz. , by which they did constantly express *Aleim*, when it signified *God*. And whenever they rendered *Aleim* otherwise, it is certain they understood it to have another meaning besides that of the Deity.—But we are not to take for granted in the text under consideration, that *Aleim* was the original word used by St *Stephen* before the High-Priest and Council. It is remarkable, that He had in quoting the Old Testament, mentioned the *Aleim* of the Hebrews above a dozen times; in all which places St *Luke* renders the Original by . Mr H. and his followers may complain as they please, that *this is nothing to*
the

upon *CHERUBIM*. 383

the Hebrew. What I say is, that *St Luke* cannot be supposed to have used *αγγελοι*, in in the text, for want of a word that he thought was expressive of *Aleim*, if that had been the original word used by *St Stephen*; or to have used it, if *St Stephen's* word, whatever it was, had not signified in *Syriac* what *αγγελοι* does in *Greek*. This is a just conclusion. Whereas *Mr H's* account of the matter is, in effect, no better than this, viz. because *St Luke* had no *Greek* word sufficiently expressive of *Aleim* in it's proper sense, therefore he took an extraordinary step, in this one passage, and rendered *Aleim* (for that he supposes was *St Stephen's* word) by a word in *Greek*, that has no relation at all to the proper and true signification of *Aleim*.

St Luke, like the other Evangelists, made no scruple of *Hellenizing Hebrew* words, or forming words from the *Hebrew*, when he had not a word in pure *Greek*, properly expressive: as σικερα, chap. i. 15. Σαλανας, xi. 18. Γεεννα, xii. 5. σαιον, xiii. 21. μαμωνα, xvi. 9. or of giving the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* word along with it's explanation in *Greek*: as Ταξιθα ἡ διερχομενη ενομενη λεγεται Δορκας, *Acts* ix. 36. Ακελδαμα
τ81ε5

384 DISCOURSE III.

τῶν χαρίων αἰματός, *ibid.* chap. i. 19. Was he at a loss in this place only for expressive words? Or could *Aleim*, had that been the word, have given him any trouble here, seeing he made no difficulty in rendering it in other places?

IT is remarked also of *St Luke*, that he uses more *Hebraisms* than any other of the writers of the New Testament. There are fifty reckoned up in the first chapter of his Gospel. And there is scarce a chapter in his Writings without more or fewer of them. Even in the text now in hand *εἰς διατάγας*, is an *Hebraism* for *δια διατάγων*, *per dispositiones*, as is observed by the Critics. Neither is *διατάγη* itself a word used by the Heathen Greeks, who always wrote *διατάγμα* or *διαταxis*.

THE same is observed of all the Writers of the New Testament, that they abound, though in a less degree, in *Hebraisms* *, and are tinctured with *Syriasm*,

* *Caspar Wiffius*, in his *Dialectologia Sacra*, reduces the *Hebraisms* in the New Testament, to thirteen classes. And *Jo. Vorstius*, in his *Philologia Sacra*, to thirty-one classes. Whosoever consults these, or *Glassius*, *Phil. Sacr.* or *John Leusden's Phil. Hebr. Græc.* may see how closely the language of the New Testament is adapted to the turn or idiom of the Hebrew.

riasm^{*}, as well as use expressions in all the Greek Dialects; and never confine themselves to such words as the *Heathen Greeks* made use of, (and of whose language Mr H. † so much complains) but use,

* There is no example, for instance, of the *Dual* number in all the Greek Testament. The reason of which is thought to be, (*J. Leusden, Phil. Heb. Gr. p. 13, and 76.*) that the *Syrians* never used the *Dual* number as the *Greeks* did, and *Hebrews* too, if we may judge from the pointings.

† *Power Essent. and Mechan. p. 91.* “The knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue, so of the Scriptures, which had been corrupted by the apostate Jews, was not recovered by those, *we call Fathers*, in the primitive Church. They writ what they had by the Writings of the New Testament, and by tradition from the Apostles and inspired Men. They knew little or nothing from the Hebrew, which contained the principal part of the evidence, *had not words in their languages*, so frequently use words, which did not perfectly express the points they understood by tradition, which are contained in the Hebrew, nay sometimes express them uncertainly.” &c.

See more to the same effect, p. 73. and 78. *ibid.* At p. 127. *ibid.* speaking of the Hebrew, he says,

“That language, where and *where only* the knowledge of things treated of are to be found, so as to be able to look for the meaning of a word, or to compare the usage of it in several places where it is writ, *without which the New Testament cannot be understood, but is liable to be construed as the Heathen Greeks used the words.*”

But

386 DISCOURSE III.

use, as they see occasion, the language of the *Hellenistical* Jews, and form their expressions

But now if we may neither construe the Greek Testament as the Heathen Greeks used the words (though the revelation recorded by the Evangelists and Apostles, being in *Greek* made *that* a sacred language too), nor as the Christian Fathers used the words (for they understood little or nothing of Hebrew, but *writ what they had, only* by the writings of, and tradition from, the Apostles, and inspired Men), nor as the Hellenist Jews used the words, (for they had *corrupted* them, he says, had disguised in their Greek the Original Record, and took care to conceal the sense of every Hebrew word that concerned the Christian Faith, in their Greek versions) What rule have we left for interpreting the language of the New Testament?

The only expedient according to Mr *H.* is,—We must learn Hebrew; and so interpret the Greek in the New Testament, (at least all the capital Words pertaining to Faith and Salvation) by the Original *Hebrew* of the Old Testament. And unless we take this method we *begin at the wrong end*, says *Examiner Examined*, (in a note at p. 80.)

The question recurs; What rule have we for interpreting the language of the Old Testament?

The LXX version, which has been commonly thought of great use towards discovering the meaning of Hebrew Roots, and a pretty sure inlet into the general knowledge of the whole language was not only made by Jews, not to be trusted, but is liable to be construed as *Heathen Greeks used the words*. The Hebrew Lexicons, Grammars, and rules of construction which have been commonly applied to as helps, are not only from *Rabbies* originally, whose purpose is to blind and deceive us in points of greatest consequence to be known, but are liable to be construed, being

pressions as often as they think proper, according to the Hebrew Phraseology. From which liberty of stile, as well as from the

ing mostly in the Latin tongue, as Heathen *Rome* used the words. And other ordinary helps besides these there are none.

○ If therefore we are not to take the sense of Hebrew words from any of the versions, *Old* or *New*; nor to form rules of construction, or grammar from any of the rules by which those versions were made; What are we to do? "We are to examine (says Mr *H.*) each word in the "Hebrew Scripture by the usage in itself." *Remarks*, P. 394.

I leave the reader to form his own conceptions of this method, when all the usual helps abovementioned are excluded, and to make his own judgment of it's usefulness; whilst I presume only to infer, that if this method will do for understanding the Hebrew of the Old Testament, Why should it not serve also for interpreting the Greek of the New? And if by this, or by any other means, the Greek of the New Testament may be learned independently on the Hebrew, it must, as it is our Original Record of the Revelation by *Jesus Christ*; be interpreted by the rules of the language itself, although they be the same, for the most part, that the Heathen Greeks made use of. The knowledge of the Hebrew will, indeed, be subservient towards explaining several peculiar phrases, or idioms borrowed from thence. But in other respects, the Greek of the New Testament seems to be as good authority for ascertaining the meaning of some words in the Hebrew of the Old, as the Hebrew of the Old is occasionally for ascertaining the meaning of phrases in the New. They frequently prove guides into the sense of each other. The advantage is mutual. The Greek is explanatory of the Hebrew, as well as it receives explanation from thence.

388 DISCOURSE III.

copiousness of the Greek Language itself, it appears greatly improbable that St *Luke* should have been destitute of expressive words for any idea that he intended to convey.

THE other passage quoted out of the New Testament was, *Gal.* iii. 19. "The Law was *ordained by Angels*—διαταγεις δι' αγγελων, in the hand of a Mediator." "Ordained by *Aleim*, (Gr. by *Angels*)" says Mr *H. Pow. Ess.* p. 108. Here he takes the same liberty with St *Paul*, writing originally in *Greek*, that he had supposed St *Luke* to take with St *Stephen* speaking in *Hebrew* or *Syriac*. And presumes he has as good reason to interpret St *Paul*'s αγγελοι by *Aleim*, as the Evangelist had to render St *Stephen*'s *Aleim* by αγγελοι. But either supposition is unwarrantable. There is no reason to think St *Luke*'s αγγελοι was a translation of *Aleim*; and it is certain St *Paul* gives it not as a translation, but as an original Word.

HIS next instance, indeed, is much more to the purpose. *Power Essent.* p. 108. *Psal.* viii. 5.—*Heb.* ii. 7. "Thou madest him a little lower than the *Aleim*. Gr. *than the Angels*." The *Hebrew* is מעט מאלהים.

מַלְאָכִים. LXX. (from whence also St Paul)
 βραχυ τι παρ' αγγελος. Here is an acknowledged version of *Aleim* by *Angels*. Upon which Mr *H.* adds—— “ That this and “ the texts abovementioned, have made “ writers forget the difference between “ *Jehovah Aleim*, and their creatures, and “ readers gape and swallow any thing.” *ibid.*——But from which I shall beg leave to infer something very different, viz. That *Aleim* is a word occasionally applicable to *Angels*, as well as to *Men*, *Idols*, &c. That the LXX, where it could not signify, or did not in their apprehension signify, God himself, which is it's proper signification, gave the sense of the thing it did, or seemed to signify, by some other word; as in the present text. And that St *Paul* quoting this text from them, without changing this important word, (nay, indeed, confirming their version by his own authority, for his argument depends upon this word) is a proof that they were right, both as to their translation of the word, and as to the subject to which they applied it.

HOWEVER, therefore, Mr *H.* hath endeavoured to set aside the evidence we

390 DISCOURSE III.

have of ministring Spirits under the Mo-
saic Dispensation, by his exposition of such
passages in the New Testament, as are
quoted for that purpose out of the Old;
yet, I apprehend, whosoever peruses care-
fully the first chapters of the *Epistle to the
Hebrews*, will plainly see that *the Angels*,
which St *Paul* there speaks of, and com-
pares with *the Only begotten Son*, in order
to shew his infinite preheminnence above
them, were neither *Aleim* as Peers of the
Essence, nor *Aleim* as their Substitutes or
Delegates, viz. *Fire, Light, and Spirit*,
but *Angels* in the commonly received sense,
as defined by the Apostle, “ *Ministring
Spirits*, sent forth to minister to them
“ who are Heirs of Salvation—To which
“ of the *Angels* said he at any time, Thou
“ art my Son, this Day have I begotten
“ thee——To which of the *Angels* said
“ he at any time, Sit thou on my Right-
“ Hand, till I make thine enemies thy
“ footstool.—Are they not all ministring
“ Spirits? *λειτουργικα πνευματα.*

HERE is an appeal to the *Hebrews*,
which the Apostle could not have made
to them, if it had not been evident from
their Scriptures, that there were such
spirits

spirits employed to the benefit of Mankind. Indeed, what sort of Argument must this have been, had no account been given in the Hebrew Scriptures of an order of Beings distinct from, and inferior to, the Divine Persons, as is plain from the comparisons of them with the Son: and Beings too of a different nature from the material and mechanical Agents, as appears from the subject matter of the texts abovementioned, on which the comparison of them with the *Son* is formed? For it seems absurd to suppose, that God should say to inanimate creatures what he said to the *Son*; or to suppose it gave any honourable preference to the *Son* to say such things to *him*, as could not have been said to inanimate creatures.

IT is very true, as מלאך signifies an agent, or messenger in general, as well as an Angel or heavenly Minister.—And as רוח signifies material Wind or Air, as well as immaterial Spirit—Some interpreters have been induced to render עשה רוחות מלאכיו, (Psal. civ. 4.) “*He maketh the Winds his Messengers.*”

BUT nevertheless the Apostle’s quotation of this text seems decisive, for that

392 DISCOURSE III.

other interpretation given by our translators, of *Angels* or *heavenly Ministers*.—" *And of the Angels he saith, who maketh his Angels Spirits, and his Ministers a flame of Fire.*" *Heb. i. 7.* Because it is an undoubted application of the *Psalmist's* words to those intelligent celestial Agents, (called *Angels*) between *whom* and *the Son*, *St Paul* runs the comparison in this chapter, and before *whom* he greatly extols *the Son* in respect of Dignity and Power. Angels or Messengers in any other interpretation, can have no place in this argument. And under this interpretation, which the context requires, though they are, indeed, *Messengers* as their name *Ἀγγελοι*, imports, and *Ministers* *δουλοὶ*, as their office shews; and though they may be characterized by no higher an expression than that of *Spirit* or *Wind*, in regard to their *nature*, or that of *Flame* in regard to their power and activity in their office; yet they are greatly superior to material Wind, and Flame, as well as greatly inferior to *him*, *whose* title is *God*, *whom* they themselves are bound to worship, and *whose* Throne is for ever and ever. See ver. 6. and 8th of this chapter.

I SHALL

upon CHERUBIM. 393

I SHALL only further observe, that in St Paul's quotation from the LXX, in ver. 6. he retains their translation of עֲלֵי by αγγελοι. And in his quotation from them, ver. 8. he retains their translation of the same word by Θεοι, and applies it to the second Person, or Son only, in contradistinction to Angels. Each of them a proof that Elobim is not rightly interpreted of the Divine Covenanters according to Mr H. or of the Curfers, or Denouncers of the Bann, according to Mr Bate.

To return then to the text we were upon, viz. Gal. iii. 19. διαλαγεις δι' Αγγελων, signifies in the most reasonable construction, being given out in commandment, or spoken authoritatively by God, through the agency or ministration of Angels.

So again, Heb. ii. 2. δι' αγγελων λαληθεις λογος. The word spoken by Angels; where the argument is, that the Law delivered by the ministration of Angels, is as much inferior to the Gospel revealed by the Son, as the Angels by whom the Law was handed to the Israelites are (as is shewn in the preceding chapter) inferior to the Son, by whom the Gospel is made known to the World.

SEEING

394 DISCOURSE III.

SEEING then that the ministry of Angels at Mount *Sinai* must stand allowed as Scripture Doctrine, and seeing the *Ark of the Testimony* was made on purpose to be the repository of this Law after it was wrote, in Tables of Stone, *by the finger of God*, which was, probably, an act also of the ministring Angels. What more obvious or easy construction can be put on the golden *Cherubim*, ordered to be placed on the cover of the said Ark, at each end thereof, than that which has been most commonly received, as is confessed by Mr *H.* * viz.—that they were designed to represent † the *Angels* of God, or those

* “ The Apostates, and *almost all the Christians*, have followed them, made the figures of the *Cherubim Angels*.” *Data*. P. I. p. 208.

† “ Facti sunt (Cherubes aurei) ut collocarentur ibi ad similitudinem Cherubim Solii Gloriæ.” *Hiscuni in Drus. Maj. Not.*

“ Duo illa animalia supra propitiatorium Arcæ ficta ex metallo propter significandum Angelorum præsentiam in quorum medio ostenditur Deus.”—*Isid. Hispal.* lib. vii. c. 5.

“ Ego non dubito quin Cheruborum imagines qualescunque demum fuerint sanctos Angelos Throni Divini adstites significarint. Hoc ipse Moses non obscure indicavit quando primam cælestium Geniorum facturum mentionem emblematico Cherubinatorum nomine eos insignivit. *Gen.* iii. 24. Non ad emblematum figuram, sed ad rem emblematicè

those celestial attendants, or *Satellites* that encompassed his Throne, and served under him, when he was visibly present at Mount *Sinai* *. And that these emblems of them were fixed at each end of the cover

“blematice significatam attendens.” *Deyling. Obs. Sacr. p. 446.*

“I can only say, they were of such a shape, as the Angelical Ministers appeared in, which attended upon the Divine Majesty in the Mount; or rather such as God shewed *Moses* a pattern of, whereby to represent these heavenly Ministers.” *Patrick on Exod. xxv. 18.*

* “Omnes Angeli qui ministrabant in *Sinai* in exhibitione Legis constanter resident in hoc loco, (viz. Sanctuario) cujus indicium erant *Cherubini*.” *Gejerus in Psal. lxviii. 17.*

“Affirmat Divinus Psalter *Sinai* fuisse in Sanctuario, *Psal. lxviii. 17.* quo significat ea fuisse in Sanctuario, *συμβολικως* adumbrata, quæ reverâ in Monte *Sinai* gesta sunt, ubi Filius Dei myriadibus Angelorum stipatus apparuit ad promulgandas Leges.” *Deyling. in loc. supra cit.*

“Huc allusit *Paulus*, non enim accessistis ad contactum montem, &c. sed accessistis ad montem *Sion* & ad civitatem Dei viventis *Jerusalem* & ad *μυριαδας* *Αγγελων*.” *Genebrard in loc.*

“Non opus esse ad montem *Sinai* recurrere ut ibi Deus inter myriadas Angelorum reperiatur sicut quum Legem è Monte *Sinai* per ministerium Angelorum ferret: *Sinai* enim jam esse in Sanctuario—Ubi Deus inter *Cherubim* sedebat supra Arcam quæ tabulas legis continebat; quum enim ibi & Lex esset (in Monte *Sinai* lata) & Angeli per quos lata, & Deus à quo lata fuerat, valde emphaticè dicitur *Sinai* fuisse in Sanctuario.” *Lud. de Dieu. in locum.*

396 DISCOURSE III.

cover of the chest where the said Law was deposited, in token of their having assisted at it's first promulgation, and of their being protectors, and defenders of it *, and remembrancers or admonitors † of the Testimony contained therein.

* See *Patrick* on *Exod.* xxv. 16.

† In this sense, and in this only, can I perceive any propriety in what *Mr Holloway* says, *Orig.* Vol. I. p. 143. viz.

“ Moreover 'T'Y is put for the mouth, words, or speech,
“ i. e. from the use of the *S. Symbols for Testification*.
“ In which respect *the said Symbols* were speaking signs;
“ they gave utterance to the understanding by things as by
“ words.”

S E C T.

S E C T. III.

An Enquiry into the Etymology of the Word.

THE learned, indeed, are not so well agreed about the derivation of the word given to these emblems. It has been, is yet, and is likely to be, more a matter of conjecture than of satisfactory proof. But still this is no objection to the truth of the *Thing*, or of the account I have been giving of the meaning of these emblems, if *that* be discovered by other means, independent on the etymology of the *word*.

IF I should say on this occasion, as Mr *H.* scruples not to say on several other occasions, when light and evidence failed him, viz. “ I have not necessary materials
“ to trace it further—I am not certain
“ —Is not very material for us to know
“ —Deserves consideration, and perhaps
“ may

398 DISCOURSE III.

“ may be discovered when meanings are “ settled”—and the like, I think it would neither lay me under censure, nor turn to my discredit. For after all, every body must rest satisfied with what they already know, where they can get no further knowledge for want of the means of attaining it. Nor is the making this confession of our limited attainments any argument of supineness, or indifference in the man that makes it, as has been suggested by those who seem to think every thing may be, and ought to be, accounted for by us.

IT is no wonder therefore, if the interpreters have gone into a variety of sentiments on the original of this Name. The exposition of it most generally received by the Christian Fathers, was that of *multitudo cognitionis* *. To account for

* “ Nomen Cherubim à Sapientiæ vel Scientiæ multitudine Angelis datum esse vetus fuit in Ecclesiâ persuasio.” — *Job. Froome*, who mentions particularly *Clem. Alexand.* *Origen*, *Athanasius*, *Augustin*, *Chrysostom*, *Anastasius*, *Gregorius*, *Philastrius*, *Sophronius*, and *Theodoret*, as being of this sentiment. *Theol. Philolog.* Vol. I. p. 120.

“ Cherubim, si quis nomen interpretatur notat cognitionis multitudinem, sive multam notitiam.” *Procop. Gaz.* *Soph.* in *Gen.* iii. 24.

“ Cherubim

for which *Spencer* supposes, that *Cherub* may be an old Hebrew word for *sciens*, *gnarus*, *solers*. And *Philo* * and *Suidas* † interpret the word in the plural by *much knowledge*. *Marinus Marfennus*, therefore, conjectures *Cherub* to be a compound of נִכְר, *cognoscere*, and רֹב *multitudo*. And were such compositions to be allowed of, another, perhaps, would conjecture from the

“ *Cherubim* ex Hebræo in linguam nostram interpretantur *Scientiæ multitudo*. Sunt autem sublimium agmina Angelorum, qui pro eo quod vicinius positi divinâ scientiâ cæteris amplius pleni sunt, *Cherubim*, hoc est, *plenitudo Scientiæ* appellantur.” *Isidorus Hispal.* lib. vii. c. 5.

See also *Spencer*'s reference for this interpretation to a Syriac Lexicon, and to *Joh. Darenfis*.—p. 765, and 766. In this Syriac Lexicon (which was composed by *Isa bar Ali*) one signification assigned to the word כְּרוּבִים, is סְנִיאוֹת יְדַעְתָּא, *multitudo Sapientiæ*. The same meaning is also given to the word by *Josua bar Bahlul*, another famous Syrian Lexicographer. But these two authors being Christians, and living late (the former in the IXth, the other in the Xth century), it may be questioned whether their interpretation be not rather taken from the notion which the Fathers and Ecclesiastical writers entertained of this word, than from the ancient usage of it in the Syrian language.

* *Philo*, in *Vita Moysi*, lib. iii. Ἄ παρρητα μὲν γλωττη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐρεῖται Χερουβίμ, ὡς δ' ἂν Ἕλληνες εἰποιεν, Ἐπιγνώσις καὶ Ἐπισήμη πολλή.

† *Suidas* under Χερουβίμ — Ἐρμηνεύεται γνώσις πεπληθυσμένη.

400 DISCOURSE III.

the *Chaldee* termination כְּרוּבִין, (and it is also often wrote in Greek Χερουβִים) that it was a composition of כ and רוב and בִּינָה, or the *Chaldee* בִּינָה *intelligentia*, (both from בון *intelligere*) and signified *Quasi multitudo cognitionis*.

YET these cannot be admitted, as so many and so strong objections lie against such compositions in the Hebrew tongue as these are: for which I refer to what was said in the first of these Dissertations. Though I must own, there seems to me great probability that the Fathers, who appear to have been little skilled in Hebrew, might take it for a compound word, of which רוב *multitudo* was a part: for otherwise it is very hard to account how they come so generally to espouse the exposition abovementioned. And though it does not appear, at least not to me, how knowledge or intelligence can be made out of the word, according to the rules of the language; yet some account may be given, how it might possibly be collected from the descriptions of the *cherubic figures*. For with the *Platonists*, wings * were deemed

* “Sunt enim, teste Platone, Alæ Hieroglyphicum
“Sapientię.”

deemed a Symbol of Wisdom and Knowledge. And the same was also thought to be symbolically expressed by their being *full of Eyes, before and behind*; as we learn from *Theodore†* *. So that by joining either, or both of these *Symbola Sapientiæ*, taken from the descriptions of the *Cberubim*, with the supposed true construction of their name, the Fathers might take up with the interpretation that has been just now mentioned †. And as it was their general opinion that the *Cberubim* were Angels, they would think the word, under this construction ‡, very aptly applied to the two images placed at the two ends of the cover of the Ark, as symbols of the Hosts of Angels, on the Right-hand

D d

and

“*Sapientiæ.*” *Kirch. Oedip. Egypt. Vol. I. Part. ii. p. 155.*

* Upon the words, *Οι νῶτοι αὐτῶν πληρεῖς ὀφθαλμῶν. Ezek. i. 18. Theodore†* thus comments. *Τέτρεσι γνῶσεως ἦσαν ἀναπλεοί, τὸ το δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν Χερουβὶμ ἐρμηνεία δηλοῖ.*

† And this may likewise be the reason why the two *Syrian* Lexicographers, mentioned in the note above, give this as another sense of *כְּרֻבִים*, viz. *videns oculis, perspicax.*

‡ *ὁσεὶ πληθῶν. — Πληθῶν στρατίας οὐρανίας. Luc. ii. 13. — “Deus contentus fuerat duobus Cherubinis, ut in illo numero haud dubie repræsentabat omnes Angelos.” Calv.*

402 DISCOURSE III.

and on the Left *, that ministred at the giving of the Law, and are in other parts of Scripture described as attendants on God's throne, and as sent forth occasionally in armies and legions to fulfil his commands, as hath been shewn above.

THIS observation is not made to recommend the construction hinted in it, viz. *the likeness, or representative of the multitude*, viz. of the heavenly Hosts, as the best that can be made of the word *Cberub*, but to shew that if it were to be taken as a compound of *che* and *rub*, it ought to be taken in *this* sense, and according to *this* interpretation rather than in Mr H.'s. For רוב, as I observed in the beginning of these Discourses, never stands in Scripture for *magnas*, or *a great one*. But the instances of it as a noun expressive of *multitude* are as common, as *rab* and *rabbim* are for *great*, and *many*; as may be seen in Kircher's Concordance, under רוב for רובל, and under רב for רב.

IT

* Under this idea there appears a propriety in the connexion of יהוה צבאות with יושב הכרובים. 1 Sam. iv. 4. 2 Sam. vi. 2. The Lord of Hosts that sitteth between the *Cberubim*, viz. the emblems of his heavenly armies.

IT is preferable also to that other Etymology given by the Jews, viz. כְּרוּב from כְּרִיָּא *sicut puer*: whence they derive it, as Dr Castell says, *ineptè satis*. And no doubt were we to have recourse to a compound Chaldee word, it should rather be taken from the Chaldee רְבוּ or רְבוּא, which signifies *puer*, than from רְבִי, or רְבִיא, or רְבוּא *juvenis*, as being more suitable to the scriptural account of Angels, and particularly of those supposed to be represented in the Sanctuary by these emblems, according to what has been said before on Psal. lxxviii. 17.

As what has been now offered in order to account for the ancient exposition of Cherubim by *multitudo cognitionis*, is only conjecture, and the hypothesis of *sicut multitudo*, as just now explained, is only setting up an improbable conjecture against two others that seem still less probable; so the proposition of an etymology more agreeable to the genius, and usage of the Hebrew tongue must stand, I believe, on no other foundation than what is mere guess-work and conjecture still; for *All is so, where we have no positive direction*, as a learned Gentleman, whom I readily quote

404 DISCOURSE III.

on this occasion, has truly said. *Prel. Disc. to Elibu*, p. 20.

AND if conjectures are allowable in such cases, why may we not suppose—— That כרוב is an old Hebrew word for *hieroglyphic*——that it was well understood when *Moses* wrote, and used for all kinds of emblems, or mysterious representations expressed by Sculpture, which was the ancient sacred way of writing.——That it is a derivative of a verb, (not, indeed, extant in the language as we now have it, though most probably once a root there, as it is yet in the Syriac) viz. כרב *, the primary sense of which was to *figure*, or *represent by figurations*; whence the participle passive is regularly כרוב, a piece of Sculpture †. *Aliquid insculptum*, any thing engraven upon.

WHENCE

* Syr. כרב. *Simulare*, & vomere terram scindere. *Chald. Arare*, to make furrows and incisions in the earth.

I am informed that a learned Syrian Lexicographer, never yet printed, recounting the several significations of this verb, says, that it signifies amongst other things, *to make representations*, or *to draw pictures or images*.

† Thus *Aben-Ezra*, quoted by *Mar. de Cal.* and *Pagnin*, gives it as “Nomen universale ad omnem figuram.”

And *Schultens*’s words in his MS. *Lexicon* are, “Omnia autem (scil. quæ dicta sunt de significatis verbi כרב) arguunt

upon CHERUBIM. 405

WHENCE probably might come a word, in Greek, *cujus etymon vexatissimum*, among the critics, viz. Κυβεις, the stone on which the *Athenians* engraved their Laws. See *Hesychius* on that word: and the *Etymolog. Magn.* with what *Sylburgius* hath noted: and *Suidas* in Κυβεις, which he defines αι τας των Θεων εοπλας εχουσαι.

THENCE also might come several other words, to be found in the languages derived from the *Scythic*, all of them denoting or expressing *Sculpture*. For B. V. and F. are known to be permutable letters. Thus *Cherub* is expressed Cheruf in *Buxt.* In *Teutonic* the word for *incidere*, (see *Skinner*) is Kerben—German, Kerven. — *Angl. Sax.* Ceorfan — *English*, Carve—*Camb. Brit.* Kervio.—*Hibern.* Corrbham. (Vid. *Fran. Junii Etymologicon*.)

D d 3

G LIKE-

“ arguunt primariam virtutem *sculpendi*, *insculpendi*: hinc
 “ jam arare nostrum quoque defluxit, quasi *incidere*, *inci-*
 “ *suris* aperire terram. Transfertur eadem *inciso*, ad ima-
 “ gines quæ *sculpuntur*. Atque inde tum generatim exisset
 “ *sculpta effigies*, tum speciatim *ιεεργλυφον* exculptum
 “ quam artificiosissime, & consecratum ad aliquid sublimius
 “ significandum. Tales fuere haud dubie *Effigies Cheru-*
 “ *bica* super Arcam collocata & consecrata.”

406 DISCOURSE III.

G LIKEWISE, and C are permutable. Hence, therefore, probably γραφω among the Greeks. For γραψαι is explained in *Hesychius* by ξυραι, χαραξαι, αμυξαι. *German*, Graven. *Angl. Sax.* Grafan. *English*, Grave, Engrave. *French*, Griffon, or an imaginary animal with the body of a lyon, and with face, feet, and wings of an eagle, which never existed but in painting and sculpture.

Now if כרוב may be allowed to have been once used in the Hebrew tongue, as it is known to have been used in the Syriac dialects, viz. in the sense of *engraving* figures, *carving* images, &c. the noun כרוב which is regularly derived from it, will yield a sense which very well corresponds with the use of the words *Cherub* and *Cherubim*, in all the texts where they denote what was *image work* in the Tabernacle and Temple.

AND as emblems or representations of things pertaining to Religion were hieroglyphics, these words might come to carry that notion in distinction from all other figure-work or imagery that was not of sacred interpretation: and to be used in a more eminent sense of those symbolical
Figures

Figures which God commanded *Moses* to make at the ends of the cover of the Ark, whose form which *Moses* describes in part, with *wings* and *faces*, and whose posture and situation at the seat or throne of God's visible residence would easily suggest, and might sufficiently declare their meaning and use, viz. to represent, under a form exhibited in a pattern at the Mount, the angelic hosts that attended God at Mount *Sinai*, and minister to him in his dispensations to mankind. And as signs, and the things signified by them, are often found to interchange names with each other, these might come to be applied to those Beings themselves, of which the carved images were the standing emblems, and so the Angels might be called by the name of their hieroglyphical representations. This may account for *Moses's* use of the word in *Gen.* iii. 24. the notion of those ministring spirits being become familiar to the *Israelites* under the word *Che- rubim*; and for *Ezekiel's* use of it too, who, when he had discovered, after repeated contemplation of his vision, that the חיות he saw were Angels or ministring Spirits, declared that he knew them to

408 DISCOURSE III.

be *Cherubim*, or representatives in vision, of what the material *Cherubim* in the Temple represented in solid imagery.

THERE is another derivation of this word mentioned by Dr *Castell*, under כרוב, which, though it hath given Mr *H.* very great offence *, is patronized by men of great

* “ *Castell*, who is the most averſe to theſe truths of any pretender to Chriſtianity I ever ſaw, who has not given any conſtruction of *Jehovah*, nor mentioned *Elohim* in his *Hebrew*, has in the moſt impudent manner, p 1797, under *Caraba Arab.* Numb. VI. printed י. q. ar. קרב aut pro eo—*propinquans fuit appropinquavit*, and another below קראב, *mutuo ad illum appropinquavit, & affinitatem cum eo contraxit.*” *Remarks on the Obf.* p. 124. his own edit.

But I muſt do Dr *Castell* the juſtice to obſerve, that he hath both given a conſtruction of *Jehovah*, and mentioned *Elohim* in his *Hebrew*:

He hath explained יהוה, “ *Nomen Dei proprium, ipſum ab eſſentiâ denominans, quaſi Ο ων, Ο νν, καὶ Ο ἐρχομεν.*” Which with placing it under יהוה is ſurely giving a ſufficient conſtruction of it. And, which might have recommended him to better uſage from Mr *H.* he there aſſerts the title of the Meſſiah to this name, and from thence to Divinity. And concludes from יהוה and אלהים an Unity of Eſſence, and a Trinity of Perſons.

He hath alſo put אלה and אלהים at the end of his *Hebrew*, only there hath ſlipped in a reference of one line to a *Syriac* word in another place.

So both theſe accusations of him muſt paſs for unjuſt ones. And as for his manner (which Mr *H.* calls *moſt impudent*) of putting קרב under the *Arabic Caraba*. The reader

great skill and learning in the Oriental languages. There is a remarkable passage of Dr Hyde, in his *Relig. Vet. Persarum*, where, speaking of the angels which according to the doctrine of the *Persians*, presided over the several mouths, he has these words. “Hujusmodi (quales nempe “Gabriel, Uriel, Raphael, & Michael, qui “perpetuo circumstant folium divinum,) “sunt qui generali nomine dicti sunt “כְּרוּבִים *Cherubim*, i. e. propinqui angeli “qui scil. Deo propius quam alii accedunt: nam כָּרַב *Charab* est i. q. קָרַב *Karab* appropinquavit. Et כְּרוּב seu קְרוּב “est propinquus existens *.”

Whether the rule that *letters of the same organ are sometimes changed for each other*, mentioned by the Grammarians, is applicable in this case to the Hebrew language, as it is to these dialects of it in the opinion of those who are conversant in them, I know not. If it were, this etymo-

reader may see whether Mr H. hath made good his charge by any thing he hath said in his *Remarks*, where he endeavours to confute this etymology.

* *Zamachsbari*, I am told, in his MS. Arabic Lexicon explains כָּרַב by קָרַב, and from thence interprets *Cherubim* in the same manner: as do also other Arabic Dictionaries, which give the same construction to the word.

410 DISCOURSE III.

etymology would have the advantage of the former, as shewing the word to be primarily significative of the Angels themselves, and only borrowed from them in it's application to their emblems.

BUT the reader will judge for himself, and remember withal, that conjectures can stand only upon their own probability, which is all the authority they have, be it more or less; and that at this distance of time *, conjecture only can supply what is wanting in the original records, for the satisfaction of our curiosity on this subject. So that we can neither make ourselves sure that we have discovered the true origin of the name of *Cberubim*, or have just and right ideas of their form from the indistinct descriptions given of them. And yet, I apprehend, the proofs of their emblematical use in the Tabernacle and Temple, are sufficient to satisfy a reasonable enquirer; and that there is a warrantable authority from thence, for the application

* Meminerit Lector nos à primo *Cberubinorum* origine longo sæculorum intervallo diffitos, & deum de iis plerumque tam obscure loqui quasi *Cberubim* non minus à Christianorum intellectu, quam olim à Judæorum visu removeri, & semper velo quodam tegi voluisset.—*Spencer*, p. 802.

upon CHERUBIM. 411

cation of the name to those spiritual Beings, of which the material *Cherubim* are understood to have been the representatives.

AND is this *all*, it may be said, that we are to learn from this extraordinary, and ever memorable hieroglyphic in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*? I answer, I conceive it is *all*, because it is *all* that the most curious and inquisitive have been able to learn, or make out to any degree of satisfaction for the mind to rest in, after many close researches for many ages; and because it is *all* that seems capable of being discovered by the lights which Scripture affords us into this matter, or by any other (if in this case there can be any other) proper evidence. If more than this can be discovered, and either the form of the Tabernacle and Temple *Cherubim* can be more precisely described, or the intention of them more fully explained than they are in the Sacred Writings, such discovery, description, or explanation, *accompanied with reasonable evidence of it's truth, or probability*, will be, as it ought to be, thankfully received. But whatever new instructions are offered us on this subject,
with-

412 DISCOURSE III.

without being recommended by such reasonable evidence, we cannot be under any obligations to acknowledge and espouse, any more than we can be supposed to reject what lights, or evidence we really have, because there are some persons who altogether disparage those lights or evidence as insufficient to build any thing upon: persons, who rather than appear doubtful, or confess themselves perplexed, (which in some cases no man needs be ashamed to own) choose to represent the *Cberubim* as mere ornaments of the Tabernacle or Temple, without use or meaning in any other respect. Which is the opposite extreme to Mr *H.*'s.

IT may be said again, How will either of the accounts abovementioned, concerning the etymology of the word, square with such other constructions put upon the living creatures called *Cberubim*, in *Ezekiel*'s visions, as these? viz. That they were prefigurative of the four Evangelists, (according to *Irenæus*, and those who follow his sentiment) or—that they alluded to the four standards in the camp of the Israelites; (an opinion, I think, taken from the Jews only) or—that they

upon *CHERUBIM*. 413

they were emblematical of *Christ*, *Trajan*, *Severus*, and *Maximinus*; (which is the interpretation of some Christians in the later ages) or——those more plausible constructions of their being symbolical of the Divine Attributes; or——their representing a combination of the services of all the animal creation to the glory of God, hieroglyphically expressed by the chief animals of each kind; or, lastly, ——of their being figurative in *Ezekiel*, of the Levitical ministry, in Revelations of the Christian ministry? (And they who have entered into this last argument, have shewn a singular aptitude in the descriptions of the *Cherubim* in *Ezekiel*, and of the beasts in the *Apocalypse*, for expressing these instituted orders among men.) ——To all this I can only say, that if *Cherub* may be presumed to have been anciently used, as was mentioned above, as a common term for an hieroglyphic, it might by usage be understood of every sacred and mysterious representation, whether made by sculpture or not, and so a way will be easily opened for reconciling the *word* with the *thing*, under any of the foregoing interpretations of *Ezekiel's* visions.

BUT

414 DISCOURSE III.

BUT as I must leave all these different conjectures to their own weight; to be approved or rejected, as the reasons given to support them by their respective fautors are found to recommend them or otherwise; so I must leave the consideration of the etymology of the word, under any of these constructions, to the persons themselves, who approve of, and abide by the said constructions: allowing each, as is most fitting, to make the best of his own hypothesis or sentiment, but not allowing him to obtrude it upon others as the only one deserving to be embraced, or to decry all other expositions as insufficient, or insignificant.

WHOSOEVER takes that magisterial method in a subject of such intricacy as this of the *Cherubim* is, and upon which men have gone into such a variety of sentiments, appears to think more highly of his own tenets, than justly of mankind. Peremptory assertions, if not well supported, are so far from contributing to rectify mistakes, that they rather do harm to truth itself.

S E C T.

S E C T. IV.

C O N C L U S I O N.

LET then Mr *H.*'s friends carry the necessity of our admitting his explanations of *Cherubim* as high as they please, and let them speak as severely, or as slightly as they please, of those who obstruct the reception of his discoveries on this subject, still this makes nothing for the certainty, or even probability, of those discoveries: much less doth it prevail for the exploding the notions that are most commonly received about the *Cherubim*.

IF what he has advanced, though tendered as if it were a demonstration, be shewn to be inconclusive; if what he has urged as plain Scripture proof, be found to rest wholly on a new and as yet unauthorised construction of certain Hebrew words, (I may add, and of some Greek ones

416. DISCOURSE III.

ones too) and upon inferences rather arbitrary than just or necessary; if what appears the most specious in his accounts upon the first view, appears afterwards upon examination mostly hypothetical, and does not when brought into a closer compass, and surveyed with a more attentive eye, strike the imagination so strongly and agreeably as some of the particulars, in their detachment from each other, do, from their advantageous situation among other matters, with which he has mixed them in different parts of diverse treatises; — (all which, I submit to the judgment of those who have read his Works, and these Remarks on that part of them which relates immediately to this subject) — Then his account of the *Che-
rubim*, how well soever adapted it be to the taste of some men, by being singular and new, will scarce deserve such preference to the other accounts given by learned writers, as to render them all upon the comparison worthless and impertinent.

It is, indeed, expected of every one that he should speak well of what he really approves in the writings of another. And if he is persuaded that he is more-

over

over benefited by them, it is but just and honourable to express a grateful sense of his advantage and improvement, by giving the author all the praises that he thinks him intitled to. But this may be done without depreciating and disparaging the instructions of others as of no value or consequence.

MR H. may, by his followers and advocates, be allowed his rank and place among the expositors of Scripture, without shutting them all out of doors as useless and insignificant. And particularly with respect to his construction of the *Che-
rubim*, (which seems to be applauded by them as his master-piece) he may be allowed to have hit upon an unexpected and surprizing conjecture (and an ingenious one too, by those who think it so) upon a dark and puzzling point of sacred History, on which many before him had tried their skill with various success; this, I say, might be urged by his followers, without crowning his encomium with his having disinherited all other mens labours, by the only valuable production on the argument with which the Christian world hath been hitherto blest'd. Or, at least,

E c

they

418 DISCOURSE III.

they who think thus highly of his labours in this, or any other subject, should bear with those who imagine they *have reasons* to think very differently. A moderation which will be the more seasonable and becoming in them, as they may perhaps, if they will examine *such reasons* impartially, come in time to think differently themselves.



F I N I S.

